

THE
IRISH
MASSACRE
Set in a Clear Light,

WHEREIN

Mr. *Baxter's* Account of it in the History of his own Life, and the Abridgment thereof by Dr. *Calamy*, are thoroughly consider'd, and the Royal Martyr fully Vindicated.

TOGETHER

G. 893.

With Two Letters from Mr. *Chaundler*, (the Dissenting Teacher in Bath, Reviving the aforesaid Account) to the Reverend Mr. *Thomas Cart* at Bath, with his two Replies to Mr. *Chaundler*.

THE SECOND EDITION with ADDITIONS.

LONDON:

Printed for George Strahan, at the Golden-Ball, against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1715

THE HISTORY OF THE
ROYAL SOCIETY OF LONDON
IN A LETTER

TO THE
HONOURABLE THE LORDS OF THE
COUNCIL OF HIS MOST EXCELLENT
MAGNETY THE KING

TOGETHER

WITH TWO LETTERS FROM MR. CHURCH
TO THE HONOURABLE THE LORDS OF THE
COUNCIL OF HIS MOST EXCELLENT
MAGNETY THE KING

THE SECOND EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

LONDON

Printed for George Streater, at the Golden Ball, against the
Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1712.

THE PREFACE.

IF any thing can give a Man a Prejudice to a Cause, the Infamous Methods taken to support it will. For a good Cause needs nothing but Truth to maintain it, and Scorns to make Lies its Refuge, and have recourse to Calumny to support it. Such Methods indeed may serve a present turn and prejudice People against an Adversary for a while, but when they are laid open and the Falshood of the Calumny as well as Malice of the Raiser or Publisher of it set in a just Light, the World begins to suspect the Cause, to distrust the Assertor of it, and from one weak Argument exposed, one Calumny clearly refuted, to infer, that he may fall into other Errors, and may be guilty of other Falshoods who wou'd not boggle at one, and that he was sensible, his Cause was bad, or he would not have taken so base a Method to support it.

Reason will tell a Man of common Sense this: What then can we think of the Author of the late Pamphlet in 8vo. Entituled, *The Parliamentary Right maintain'd, &c. with Reflections on the now lurking Pretender, &c. and Published since my Vindication of King Charles, who, in order to obtain the Point he aims at, has taken measures so justly blameable? An ill-grounded Confidence, uncharitable Reflections and unmannerly Insults over an Adversary are what may be well expected*

The P R E F A C E.

from a Writer full of himself, and who has considered his Subject but by halves: Falshoods in Reasoning and wrong Inferences from true Facts and Relations may be in some measure accounted for by a Person's want of Understanding, and the Man is only blameable in setting up for a Writer without Sense to qualify him for one; but Falshoods in Fact and Calumnies barbarous and incredible in their Nature and Circumstances must proceed from an Heart full of Rancour and Bitterness, and can only be the Assertions of a Man abandon'd to Truth and Justice, whose Word ought to be depended on in nothing, since these clearly prove that he Writes, not for Truth but to serve a Party.

Of what there is of this Nature in the forementioned Author I shall only take notice of one Instance, which occurs p. 39. and it is his Revival of (what the pre-
See p. 193,
and 250. sent Bishop of Sarum in his Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, calls more than once) a damnable Calumny on King Charles I. viz. of his giving Orders for the Irish Massacre and Rebellion, this he endeavours to prove, only by an Assertion of his own, viz. that the M. of Antrim commanded the Cut-throats concern'd therein (an Assertion, which is not only an abominable Falshood, but has not the least ground or foundation in History to support it) and by the Letter wrote by King Charles II. Order, July 10 1663, for which he refers to a Volume of State Tracts Printed by Richard Baldwin in 1692: A Book which tho' I have sought for, I have not been able to meet with. But as the Letter for which it is referr'd to, is the same with that which I have quoted out of Ludlow's Memoirs, and is already considered in the following Sheets (where I have at large given an Account of the M. of Antrim's Conduct, shewn the falshood of the Inferences drawn from the Words of the Letter, and demonstratively proved the Royal Martyr's Innocence) I need say nothing more with regard to this Passage. But shall take this Opportunity of assuring the World, that when any thing new is advanced against what I have maintain'd in these Papers, it shall not fail of being consider'd as
it

The P R E F A C E.

it ought; having, since they were sent to the Press, met with still further Evidences of the King's Innocence, and procured Materials and Records confirming the particulars of the Account given of the M. of Antrim's Conduct in my Letter of Feb. 19.

I shall improve this Opportunity likewise by giving some further Account of the Pamphlet called Murder will out, as I meet with it in the Earl of Arlington's Letters to the Duke of Ormond; from whence it appears that it was not first written and published, as Mr. Long conjectures, after the Revolution, but was then only revived, as proper for that juncture of Affairs, and published in Confidence of that Impunity, which before, it cou'd not be hop'd for. For nothing but Secrecy and Concealment could screen the Author from the Punishment he deserved at the time of his Writing and sending it first to the Press, which was soon after the Date of that Letter of King Charles II. which makes the Substance, as it was the Ground, of the Pamphlet. For Lord Arlington says in a Letter dated October 17 1663, that the Surveyors of the Press had among other malicious Papers, found one with this Title, Murther will out, accompanied with a Preamble, saying, the King has accused his Father to clear my Lord of Antrim, and then follows his Majesty's Letter to the Duke of Ormond; to whom Lord Arlington recommends the making Enquiry, whether it were printed in Ireland, and adds, that 'tis certain at least, that the Instruction and Composure of it came from thence. To this Letter and Account of the Pamphlet Lord Arlington refers in another Letter to the Duke of Ormond dated Jan. 30. 1664, in these Words, " This Day is the Anniversary of our late " King's Murder, and some villanous People to blot the Re- " membrance of it have, (as I am told) dispersed many Co- " pies of that seditious Paper, called Murder will out, where- " in his Majesty's Recommendation of my Lord Antrim is Prin- " ted, with some villanous Application to his Majesty, where- " of I sent you at its first coming abroad a Copy, and then " supposed the first Impression thereof came from Ireland. If " Your Grace could discover any thing of it there, it would " be

THE PREFACE

“ be a great Service to the King to have the Author and
“ Printer of it suffer some exemplary Punishment. For now the
“ Press and Pen is beginning as hot a War upon us, as if
“ they intended speedily to follow it with the Sword. In both
which Letters the Account given of the Pamphlet is exactly
the same, and it is said to consist only of the King's Letter,
and of a Preamble applying it to him, but not the least hint
is given of any Letter produced by the M. of Antrim in the
House of Commons in England, hereby furnishing us with ano-
ther Reason, to be added to those already urged, to cause us
to suspect that Letter as a Forgery.

Hence we likewise learn something of the Characters of the
Persons that wrote and published that Libel, and of the Ends they
had in so doing. They were (says Lord A.) Villanous and
Malicious Persons, the Paper it self was Seditious, the Appli-
cation of the Letter Villanous, the Author and Printer of it
merited an exemplary Punishment, for the Design of it was
to blot out the Remembrance of the Day of the King's Martyrdom,
and to encourage Rebellion against King Charles II, which the
Party at that time projected; and of which Design of theirs
Lord Arlington gives a hint in his Letter of Jan. 30, and
which appears undeniable in the Course of his Letters and
in those of M. D'Estrades.

These were the Ends, and these were Lord Arlington's Sen-
timents of the Persons who made these Inferences from King
Charles 2^d's Letter of July 10. and if the Season of Things
and Actions does not alter their Nature, what can we think
of those who make the same Inferences now? Are they not
entitled to the same Character, and do they not merit the
same exemplary Punishment?

Nor let them think to escape what they thus deserve, tho'
none of the Royal Martyrs Race now sits upon his Throne,
or has it in his Power to avenge his Cause; or imagine thence
that they may securely insult his Memory, or asperse that of
our late Queen, as has been barbarously done by some since
her never to be sufficiently lamented Death. For it is the
common Cause of Princes to maintain the Rights and Respect
due

The P R E F A C E.

due to each other. And as King James I. when he declared himself against giving the Title of King of Bohemia to the Palsgrave, and against adhering to the Bohemians in the Deposition of their Sovereign Prince, express'd his Sentiments in these Words, There is an implicate Tie among Kings which obliges them, tho' there be no other Interest or particular Engagement, to stick to and right one another upon any Insurrections of Subjects; as there is thus a Tie and Obligation on them, with regard to the Rights of their Crowns, so is there likewise with regard to the Reputation of their Persons, and it is their common Interest to avenge any Injury offer'd to each others Memory, as the only effectual way to secure a proper Respect to their own.

Howel's Letters. p. 67.

But whether this Reason for the publick Censure of such Slanders, and for the Punishment of the Authors and Publishers thereof, have its effect or no, I hope, that at least all honest Men in their private Stations will not be wanting in vindicating the Royal Martyr's Innocence; I am sure that for my part, in defect of any other way of shewing it, I shall always this way shew my Gratitude for the Sufferings he underwent, the Blood he shed and the Life he laid down for the Service of the Church of England; which I think my self more especially oblig'd to, since there is reason to think that it is his Death, or, what occasioned it, his Zeal for our Church, which has moved a Sett of Men to load his Memory with such heavy Calumnies, and has made the very Name of his Family Odious among them.

Books

Books Printed for George Strahan Book-seller, at the Golden-Ball, over against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill.

A Seasonable Warning for the Church of England. *He that being often reprov'd, hardeneth his Neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without Remedy, Prov. 29. 1.*

The Wolf strip'd of his Shepherd's Cloathing. Wherein the Designs of the Dissenters against the Church, and their Behaviour towards Her Majesty, are laid open. With the Case of Occasional Conformity consider'd.

The new Association of those call'd *Moderate Church-men*, with the Modern *Whigs* and *Fanaticks*, to undermine and blow up the present Church and Government. With a supplement on occasion of the New Scotch Presbyterian Covenant. Two Parts.

The History of Sin and Heresy, attempted from the first War that they rais'd in Heaven, through their various Successes and Progress upon Earth, to the final Victory over them and Condemnation in Hell.

Cassandra. (But I hope not) telling what will come of it. Wherein the New Associations, &c. are considered. No. 1. No. 2.

The Bishop of Sarum's proper Defence from the Speeches said to have been spoken by him. In Three Parts.

The Fintishing Stroke. Being a Vindication of the Patriarchal Scheme of Government, in defence of the *Rebearsals*, *Best Answer*, and *Best of All*. To which is added, Remarks on Doctor Higden's Late Defence. In a Dialogue between Three H——'s.

The Case Stated, between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, in a Dialogue; wherein is shewed, that the Doubt and Danger is in the former, and the Certainty and Safety in the latter Communion: To which is added, the Case truly Stated, in Vindication of the former.

Thro' the Author's Absence from the Press the following ERRATA were committed. viz.

PAGE 1. line 11. r. carry: (line 23.) r. alleviating: (p. 6. bottom of the Margin) r. Land of Irs: (p. 7. l. 18.) r. ingenuously; (p. 11. l. 33.) r. was not very: (p. 13. l. 14.) r. seem'd: (p. 21. l. 28.) r. even: (p. 22. l. 33.) r. when in the horrid: (p. 23. l. 15.) r. but that: (p. 27. l. 14.) r. purport: (p. 29. l. 14.) r. this Conduct: (p. 34. l. 27.) r. July 10: (p. 39. l. 22.) r. greatest opportunities of: (l. 35.) r. whosesoever: (p. 40. l. 14.) r. should do this: (p. 45. l. 9.) dele as far: (l. 13.) r. in not retracting: (l. 16.) r. to a Cause: (l. 26.) r. Hour in any: (l. 27.) r. since, so that: (p. 46. l. 11.) r. latter: r. I can only: (l. 16.) dele were: (l. 35.) r. deal so freely: (p. 47. l. 9.) r. release him of: (l. 12.) r. got over: (l. 13, 14.) r. wish: (l. 26.) r. I should: (p. 48. l. 5.) r. ingenuous: (l. 2.) r. an: (l. 29.) r. he gave: r. Sir Richard Cox.

The Irish MASSACRE set in a clear Light.

I Cannot allow my self to Publish these Letters to the World, without giving some Account of the Occasion of writing them, which was this. Preaching on last *January* 30 in the *Abbey Church* of this Place, I gave in my Sermon a detail of the Methods and Practices, whereby the Rebels, of 1641 carried on their Designs, and effected the Ruin of the Church and Monarchy of England. 'Tis scarce possible for an honest Man to think of those Times, and of the Measures then taken, without Horror, and very difficult to speak of them with Tenderness. But the Part that I chose was barely to represent them. They carried indeed their own, and that a very heavy Censure with them, and are so flagrantly impious, that nothing can, at least nothing need, be added to set forth their Wickedness, or raise in good Men an abhorrence of them.

But what in such has this Effect, raises a different kind of Resentment in others: They that entertain the Principles of the Rebels of those Days, and would be glad to see the same Steps pursued, the same Practices repeated, rage at a Representation that makes them Odious, and may thereby prevent their Success. The Preacher that exposes these Practices, not the Persons who committed them, is the Object of these Mens Indignation, and whilst some pitying Expressions are offered up to their Memory, some alleviated Circumstances urged to lessen the Horror of their Crimes and greatness of their Guilt, he is sure to feel the effects of their Passions, and weight of their Censure for setting in a just light, *Actions*, which, Execrable as they are, were yet acted many Years ago: Tho' he does this on a Day set apart by Authority to implore God's Pardon for those very Actions, and to deprecate his Judgments which still lye heavy upon this Nation on Account thereof: And though these very Persons thus Displea-

fed with the Remembrance of the Hypocrify, Treachery, Rebellion, and other Impieties of a Faction, and one fet of Men difsenting from our Church, who once triumphed in the actual Ruin of it, and ftill threaten it with their Attempts, can dwell for ever on all the fhocking or unjuftifyable Practices of another Body of Men, Enemies indeed to our Church, but fo difproportioned in Numbers, and of Principles fo contrary to the Spirit and Genius of this Nation, and whose very Name is fo odious to the Generality of even the common fort of People, who have a fenfe of nothing elfe; that a reasonable Man can hardly apprehend any real Danger from them.

But Men's Actions and Cenfures are not always very confiftent, and 'tis no unusual thing for them to condemn in others, that which they allow in themfelves, and to exclaim againft that method which differves their Cause, which they applaud when it promotes it. And if I have met with any Reproaches, or raifed any Refentments by a juft Representation of the Crimes and Calamities of Forty One, it has been from none but fuch Persons as thefe, whose Indignation will make none uneasy, and it has only ferv'd to convince me more clearly of the reasonablenefs and ufeulnefs of fuch a Representation, which cannot furely by any loyal or good Man be thought improper, whilft there are fuch Numbers who efpoufe the fame Principles, with the Rebels of thofe Days, and who, as they juftify their Actions, may without breach of Charity, be fupposed ready to Re-aft them.

But it is paying too much Regard to this Objection to take Notice of it, for general Charges feldom need an Answer, and deferve only to be flighted. And yet nothing more Particular has been objected againft that Difcourfe, no Mifrepresentation has been charged on it, as to any one Fact asserted in it, unlefs as to that which Mr. *Chandler* the difsenting Teacher in this Place was offended at, and challenged me to prove, which as it gave Occafion for, makes alfo the Subject of the following Letters.

It cannot therefore be improper to lay before the World
that

that Passage which he excepted against, in the Words wherein I Preach'd it ; of which take this Account.

After shewing the Reasonableness of the Religious Observance of the Day from several Topicks, as particularly, from its being a proper means to obtain God's Pardon for the horrid Murder committed on it, the fatal Effects of which, and Calamities naturally flowing from it, this Nation has long groaned under, and cannot yet see an End of ; from the Encouragement which the seditious Doctrines that supported the Great Rebellion have met with of late Years, from the Profanation of the Day by a Crew of Wretches at their ~~Calves-Head-Feasts~~, from the little or no Alteration in the Principles and Conduct of the Sects and Parties, the Great Actors in the Rapines and Crimes of those Rebellious Times, that has appeared since where they have the Power of Acting, from the barbarous Treatment of the Episcopal Clergy in a Sister Nation since the Revolution, a Thing too little known and considered in this, and from the Dissenters looking on the solemn League and Covenant, that Grand Instrument of the Rebellion as still obligatory on the Nation. I after this, observed, how carefully they are taught to abhor the Memory of the Royal Martyr, as Mr. *Wesley* who was bred up amongst them, tells us in his Account of the Manner of Education in the Dissenting Academies, and laid it down for a Rule, that their Actions are the Truest Test of their Sentiments in this Point, and the surest way we can take to form a judgment of them : And then immediately follow these Words, &c.

And do not these (their Actions) shew, that they hate the Memory of King *Charles* to the utmost degree, and that they rejoyce in their Ancestors Treatment of him, and transcribe their Copy as far as they can ? Those, we know, not satisfy'd with spoiling the Royal Martyr of his Kingdom and Life, endeavoured to stab his Honour, which was dearer to him than both. Among other Slanders which their Malice threw upon him, and his Memory, this was one,

that He had an hand in, and gave Orders for the Bloody Massacre and Rebellion in *Ireland* in 1641.

The Malice and Falshood of this Charge have been sufficiently proved, and 'tis well known and attested, that when Sir *Pbelim Oneal*, Head of that Rebellion, was taken, they endeavoured to perswade him to accuse the King, and at his Tryal, nay, at his Execution too, they offered him his Life, his Estate and other Advantages, would he but charge the King with it. This was a Crime so horrid, that tho' themselves were Villains enough to engage in it, yet Sir *Pbelim* would not, but dyed declaring the King's Innocency. And yet this Curfed as well as False and Malicious Calumny their Sons have revived again within these Eight Years in the Abbridgment of *Baxter's* Life published by *Calamy*.

I insisted likewise, by way of Proof of this their Hatred of King *Charles's* Memory, on the Malicious, tho' Impotent, Endeavors, used to make the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, that Book of his, which contains the True Picture of his Soul, and this so exceeding Lovely and Beautiful an one, that it must charm all that have any Taste of Virtue and Goodness, be suspected as spurious; and on the late Republishing of all the Lies and Slanders that had been raised of him, and spreading them through the Nation in *Ludlow's* Memoirs. And whether Mr. *Chandler* has by his Conduct contributed any thing to the clearing of them from such an hatred of King *Charles's* Memory, let the World judge.

What I am further to say with regard to this Passage is, that as it is the only One, the Truth of which has been called in Question, and which Mr. *Chandler* has chose for the Subject of his Attack, so I have quoted it fairly to a Syllable as I preach'd it.

I must confess, I did not imagine that a Clergy-man of the Church of *England*, Preaching on such a Day, setting forth the Horror of those Crimes, which occasioned the Observance of it, and vindicating one of the best but most Abused Monarchs that ever lived, should be called to an Account by a Dissenting Teacher, for what he said from the
Pulpit,

Pulpit, in the Execution of his Office, in so just, at least so charitable a Cause, and in answering the Ends for which the Supreme Authority of the Nation enjoined the Observance of the Day; such a Conduct as this seeming to be no very suitable Return for that Toleration which our Laws have graciously indulg'd the Dissenters, was what indeed I did not expect. Much less could I expect an Attack on a Point of so odious a Nature, as the Loading King *Charles's* Memory with so black a Crime, as being concern'd in the *Irish Massacre*: And the World perhaps will be surprized to find any so Malignant now, as to suspect it possible for him to be guilty of so detestable an Action, from which he has been so clearly vindicated, and which never had any the least Proof to support it.

That a Calumny of so gross a size should be charg'd upon King *Charles*, and a particular Disproof of it required, one of his Race sitting upon the Throne, in a Place of as publick Resort as any in this Kingdom; a Calumny which the Rebels of 41 could never fix or prove upon him, tho' they used all Arts to do it, tho' People were put to the Rack to oblige them to Accuse him as * privy to, and concern'd in the *Irish* Rebellion, as was the Case of Sir *John Read*: and tho' at the time of its first being charged upon him, it was undeniably refuted by Mr. *Howell* and others: None of the *Irish* Rebels that fell into the Hands of the Parliament Offering to accuse him of it; and the Lord *Macguire* than whom none was deeper engaged in that Rebellion, or knew more of the Persons concern'd, and of the Measures to be taken in it, He, (as the King says in his Declaration in Answer to the Parliaments Resolution of no farther Addresses. fol. 289.) Tho' thus equally privy to all Transactions, denyed to the last, that the Rebels had any Commission from the King, with more sense of Conscience, than they who examined him expected: Tho' he was so far from

* Lord *Castlehaven's* Memoirs. p. 39.

giving them any Commission, that he had no foreknowledge of their Design, as, (says Mr. *Howel* in his *Glance on the Isle of Wight*. p. 381.) besides a World of convincing Circumstances which may clear him in this particular, appears from the Confession of the same Lord *Macguire* before his Execution on *Feb. 20. 1644*, who upon the Ladder, and another upon the Scaffold, when they were ready to breath their last, and to appear before the Tribunal of Heaven, did absolutely acquit the King in this point; and this spontaneously of their own accord, being unsought unto, but only out of a Love to Truth and discharge of a good Conscience: Nay, so far was he from having any Intimation of the Insurrection in *Ireland*, that as Mr. *Howel* attests,* the Spanish Ambassador here and his Confessor, a very Reverend *Irishman* told him, the King knew no more of it than the Great *Mogul* did; and so confident was Mr. *Howel* † of his Innocence in this respect, that he dared to pawn his Soul on the Truth of it; that such a Calumny as this, so clearly refuted on it's first Appearance in the World should be now published afresh, and a particular Disproof of it required at this distance of time, when the Revivers of the Charge might hope that all Evidence to confront it was wanting, is indeed surprizing, but it is withal very unfair Treatment of that excellent Prince on whom the Charge is laid, and is such a Method of arguing against Fact, that if it be allowed, there is no point in History so well attested but it may be disputed. And yet such a Disproof is what Mr. *Chandler* has thought fit to insist on, and demand from me as necessary for the clearing of the King. The Words of his first Letter are,

* Italian Perspective p. 289.

† Land of *Ireland* p. 217.

For Mr. Cart.

Bath Feb. 2d. 17th.

Sir,

WHereas I am inform'd by some that heard you last *Saturday*, that you should say, that the charging King *Charles I.* with being Accessary to the Irish Massacre, was a thing that had been sufficiently disproved. I take the Liberty to desire you would be pleased to let me know in what Author I may find that, for I protest I should be heartily glad to find it. In Justice to the Memory of the Royal Martyr, in Justice to your self and in Charity to me, you stand bound to do so much for one that from his Heart abhors the Doctrines of King-killing and Country Enslaving, and is Sir,

Your humble Servant

Henry Chandler.

I Received it at 4 in the Afternoon on Tuesday *Feb. 2d.* and read the Contents not without Wonder, that, whilst the Roman Catholics, who seem to have the strongest Temptations in point of Interest, and for the Credit of their Religion, to charge the King with giving them a Commission, do (as Lord *Castlehaven*, *Procurator Walsh*, *F. D'Orleans* and other of their Writers) notwithstanding this, clear him of it, and ingeniously own the Infurrection to be a Rebellion, which it could not have been, had they the King's Commission to warrant them; whilst Truth forces this Confession from them. Any, who call themselves Protestants, and pretend to a greater Purity and more Religion than others, who are called by that general Name, should allow themselves in a Practice which those abhor, should dare to repeat the horrid Slander on the King and demand a particular Disproof of it.

One might at least expect that this should be done with Modesty, or with the appearance of it, and that, whilst the
Action

Action it self might raise a Clamour and (what is more) deserve it, yet there might be something in the Manner in the circumstances of the Action to recommend it, and procure it a fairer Reception in the World. But it is the Fate of Error to be Confident, and a bad Cause seldom suffers for want of Zeal, a thing very necessary to support it, where Truth and Justice are absent. Such was the Case and Conduct of Mr. *Chandler*. Not satisfied with writing to me a Letter he fancy'd I could not answer; he spread it about with an Industry, that Prudence would not have suffered him to use, had he not been sure of Victory, nor Charity have allowed him in, whatever his Persuasions were, without much better Evidence for them, than he has yet produced in the Dispute. He shew'd it to an Alderman of this City, who spake of it publickly at a place where the Members of the Corporation met at Dinner, on *Thursday Feb. 4th*. He sent Copies of it to Shops to be given away *gratis*, that the King's Reproach, and the Credit his Performance was to gain himself, might be spread the wider, and made as Publick as possible. Three of them were the same Day, at Mr. *Harford's* Shop in the Church Yard, put into the Hand of a Person, who after Evening Service assured me of this particular Fact, and in general, of the multitude of Copies dispersed abroad.

Such Confidence and Zeal in so bad a Cause did not more surprize, than seem to upbraid me for the want thereof in a good one, and obliged me without the least Delay, to finish my first Letter to Mr. *Chandler*, which I had begun the Day before, and sent to him that Evening, and is as follows.

For Mr. Chandler.

Bath Feb. 3. 17¹³/₁₄.

Sir,

Yesterday I received from you a Letter, wherein you tell me that you are inform'd by some who heard me last

last Saturday, that I should say that the charging King *Charles I.* with being Accessory to the Irish Massacre was a thing that had been sufficiently disproved.

You have not in this point been misinformed : I did say, that the Malice as well as Falshood of that Charge have been sufficiently proved : And I had reason for saying so : Reason indeed so clear that I thought none could have been really ignorant, either of that Blessed Prince's Innocence, or of the Evidences whereby it is proved.

But since, it seems, you are, and therefore require me to tell you, in what Author you may find it ; I do now, in Answer to your Demand, and to give you the Satisfaction you want in this Matter, refer you to Dr. *Nalson's* Collections (a Book to be met with at Mr. *Hammond's*) Vol. 2. pag. 528, 529, 530. Where you may, in the Deposition of Dr. *Ker* Dean of *Ardagh*, see Sir *Phelim Oneal* clearing the King from this unjust Calumny, and declaring, that he could not in Conscience charge the King with it, tho' he had been frequently solicited thereto by fair Promises and Great Rewards, while he was in Prison. You may see Sir *Phelim* every Day of his Tryal asserting the King's Innocency, rejecting the Judges offers of restoring him to his Estate and Liberty, in Case he could bring Proof that he had any Commission from the King for the levying of War, and proving in the most satisfactory manner, that the Commission, which he had formerly pretended to have received from him, was drawn by his (Sir *Phelim's*) own Orders, and the Broad Seal fixed to it, was taken from a Patent of the Lord *Caulfield's* found in the Castle of *Charlemount* ; which Mr. *Harrison* (the Man who took the Seal from the Patent and fixed it to the Commission) likewise attests. You may see Offers of Mercy made to Sir *Phelim* at his Execution upon the barbarous Condition of falsely accusing King *Charles* in that Point ; and may likewise see him under all the Terrors of Death, and the strongest Temptations Man could lie under, bravely attesting that Prince's Innocency, and sealing the Truth of his Testimony with his Blood.

Read the whole and then consider, whether your Demand is not effectually answered, and whether any thing can more clearly disprove that (as far as I have heard) only pretence of the Charge against the King, or shew at once more evidently, the

consummate Wickedness of that Party, which accused him of so horrid a Crime, and their Inability to make good their Charge.

Both these are still farther cleared by what Sir Roger Manley says, in his History of the Rebellions in *England, Scotland, and Ireland*, printed at London, 1691. Where, after giving an Account of King Charles's causing the Marquess of Ormond to deliver Dublin, then (A. D. 1646.) besieged by the Irish Army by Land, and block'd up by the Parliament Ships on the Sea Side, into the Hands of the Parliamentary Rebels, rather than the Irish: And after briefly reciting Sir Phelim Oneal's Attestation of that King's Innocency, he expresses himself in these Words, p. 92. Nor was it only with him (Sir Phelim) but with several other Prisoners, that they most impiously endeavoured by Promises of Life, Liberty and Estate, and no less abominable Artifices, to sooth them to Confessions that might entitle the King to that Nefarious Rebellion.

Can the most prejudiced Person read this, without being convinced as well of that good Prince's perfect Innocence, as of the exquisite Malice of his Enemies.

You needed not then to have press'd me in so solemn a manner, to produce my Vouchers for what I said, or have challeng'd me to do it, as I was bound by the very strict Obligations of Justice to the Royal Martyr and myself, as well as of Charity to you. I should have gratify'd you in your Desire on less Inducements, and given you that Proof which probably you did not expect, and which I hope may be to your Conviction: And tho' you have hitherto laboured under a so very rare and almost singular Misfortune, as not to have met with any Author, that has cleared the King from being accessory to the Irish Massacre, (tho' there is scarce an Historian that writes of those times, but clears him) and have never found that it has been sufficiently disproved; yet that now you will own the Falseness of the Charge, or let me know what you will be pleased to allow as a sufficient Disproof of it.

I have shewn you, where it is (as any rational unprejudiced Person must think) sufficiently disproved: Tho' I might with better Reason have demanded of you, where it

was

was ever proved. This should have been done before a Vindication could be necessary, and it was reasonable to expect it: Since Matters of Fact, as they are too stubborn to allow of tedious Cavils, are withal plain enough to admit of an easy Proof. And yet what Proof can be brought for the Charge? None that deserves the Name, or would be allowed the Authority of a Testimony in the most trifling Instance; and therefore certainly ought not to be allowed in the Case before us, against a Person in the highest Station, and for a Charge of the blackest Nature, in proportion whereto the Proof ought to be the clearer.

Lord *Clarendon* (*History of the Rebellion. vol. 1. Book 4. p. 238.*) says, It is a Calumny without the least Shadow or Colour of Truth. And when we consider its Inconsistency, with the general Character of that Blessed Prince, and more particularly with that extraordinary Tenderness and Compassion of Nature, which was remarkable in him, and which (says Lord *Clarendon's History, vol. 3. Book 11. p. 197.*) restrained him from ever doing an hard hearted thing; with his Sentiments in point of Religion and Zeal, for the Constitution of the Church of *England*, for which he dyed a Martyr; with the whole Conduct and in a manner every Action of his Life; with his most solemn Professions and Appeals to God, who knew his Heart; (see his *Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ c. 12.*) nay, and with his very Interests too; for he never recovered the Disadvantages, which the very charging of this Calumny brought upon him; and that it had for its Support the weakest Foundation imaginable, the Pretence only of Rebels, who would be glad at any rate to make the best of their Cause, and might get a Broad Seal in a way easy to be accounted for, and which every charitable Man's Thoughts would soon suggest to him: Can we think that any Man, who was very willing to believe it true, could easily receive a Charge of such a Nature, or demand a particular Disproof of what was never proved, and is so improbable in every Respect?

Tho' therefore such a Disproof be not in it self necessary, I have nevertheless in Compliance with your Desire, and in Obedience to those Obligations you tell me, I lie under to do so much for you, laid it before you. And

And now let me add, that the same Considerations of Justice and Charity require you now to use your Endeavours to vindicate the Royal Martyr from this Calumny. You cannot but know how it has been revived within these few Years ; and with how degenerate and base a Spirit, with how bitter a Rancour, a Rancour reaching even beyond the Grave, which puts a Period to common Hatreds, some have trampled on the Ashes of that Blessed Prince, and the Calumny probably has found Belief with many.

And since it is the Duty of every one (as he has Ability and Opportunity) to do Right to the injured ; I hope, it will be your Business to undeceive all that you know labour under so unjust and uncharitable a Mistake. Such a Measure of Justice may surely be expected from one, who professes to abhor from his Heart the Doctrine of King killing. I would fain persuade my self, that in this you know your own Heart, a thing, which as it is deceitful above all things, often deceives a Mans self ; and that you would not take up Arms and fight in the Field against your Prince, and use your Sword to slay him there whom you would not murder solemnly and deliberately out of it ; and that by the Doctrines of Country enslaving you do not design in the use of that Term, to throw a Reflection on any Doctrine of Christianity, or to represent the Duties of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, (Duties which Primitive Christianity practised under the greatest Trials, and which the Church of *England* has gloried in) in an odious as well as false Light. For if you do, be assured that your Pretences to abhor from your Heart the Doctrine of King killing are vain, whilst you only boggle at a particular manner of doing the Act ; and you would do well to consider, whether a Duty, which is enjoined by the Laws of the Land can deserve this Character of Country Enslaving, and what he deserves that gives it.

I am Sir

Your Humble Servant

Tho. Carte.

To what I say of Sir *Pbelim Oneal* in this Letter, I can't think it necessary to add any thing unless it be one
Remark

Remark out of an Account of his Trial, which I have now before me, and have often heard from a very worthy Clergyman, who was born in *Ireland* before the time of the Trial, and whose Uncle, from whom he had the Relation, was present at it in the Chancery Court of *Dublin*, where the High Court of Justice sate, the Commissioners whereof were directed by a Committee, that sate in an adjoining Room, called the Chancery Chamber, what Questions they should propose to *Oneal*; a Communication being kept up by means of a Messenger who went constantly between them, and represented to the Committee all Proceedings in the Court, and brought Instructions to the Commissioners on every Occasion, speaking to them thro' a square Hole in the Wall; and the Remark is this, that Sir *Phelim* seems to appear in the Court with a Remorse for the Sins of his Life and the Blood he had shed in the Rebellion, and with an unfeigned desire of washing away the Guilt of his former Crimes by a sincere Repentance of them. And therefore when the Commissioners, whose barbarous endeavors to extort from him an Accusation of the King, during the course of his Trial, (which was drawn out to the length of several Days, that he might be work'd upon in that time, he had resisted with a Constancy, that could hardly be expected in his Circumstances, owning that he had shew'd a Commission, but it was of his own Drawing, he having been bred in the Inns of Court in *England* and the Broad Seal fixed to it, as above related; when they press'd him to plead this Commission as given him by the King, he answered, that he would not increase his Crimes by accusing an innocent Man who was Dead, herein shewing a Remorse that justly upbraids the impenitence of those Fanatick Regicides who suffered here in *England*, and such a regard to Truth and Justice, and concern for the Honour of an injured Prince, that we have Reason to wish a sort of Protestants among us would imitate.

On *Feb. 5.* in the Morning I received from Mr. *Chandler* the following Letter.

For

For Mr. Thomas Carte.

Bath Feb. 4. 1711.

Sir,

Yours I just now receiv'd. I thank you for the favour of a Reply to mine of the 2d. Instant. You may assure your self, if it had contributed in the least to my satisfaction, I should not have dissembled it. But it does not touch upon the matter, that occasioned my giving you the Trouble of my first Writing to you, which was your Reflecting upon Mr. *Baxter* (and Dr. *Calamy* his Abridger) with respect unto the Business of the Marquess of *Antrim*. A Story Printed in Mr. *Baxter's* Life near Eighteen Years ago, and which, if it has been proved to be false, I protest I have been so unhappy as not to have met with that Proof, which Proof (if such there be) I declare in the Presence of God, I will heartily thank you for directing me to, and this, whatever you think, I think a sufficient Reply to yours.

I am Sir

Your Humble Servant

Hen. Chandler.

HE calls this a Reply to my Letter, tho' it takes not the least notice of any one thing said in it, and refers me to a Story, which I never heard, and which being founded on the Conduct of a Private Man, might, at the distance of 70 Years from the Time of his Actings be hard to be confuted, or if it was to be set in a True Light, yet the doing this would require more time than I had to spare, and greater pains than my Constitution was able to bear.

On these Accounts, many who have the justest Regard to the Royal Martyr's Honour, thought it not proper for me to engage further in the Dispute, or at least, that it was not necessary to clear a Story whose falshood might sufficiently appear to all unprejudiced Persons, by it's attacking a Character so well established as His. But being enter'd upon the Controversy, and challeng'd in particular to clear this Story, being made sensible of the Prejudices whereby many were drawn aside to believe the horrid charge against him, their Confidence in the Truth of this Story, the only pretence left to uphold the Charge, and the Triumphs that would ensue a neglect of refuting it, and being

ing likewise verily persuaded that every Member of that Church, for whose Cause he dyed a Martyr, owes more to the Memory, the Remains of King *Charles*, than a bare hazard of his Health, I resolved, notwithstanding the precariousness of that and the Business of the Place, to set about refuting it: And after reading over all the Histories, Pamphlets and Accounts that I could procure, relating to the Irish Rebellion, and the Conduct of Persons during the continuance of it. I drew up the following Letter at those Hours which I could borrow from the Night, and as it has been thought to contain a clear Vindication of King *Charles*, from the Aspersions thrown upon Him in the Story which gave occasion to it, I now publish it to the World without any Alteration.

For Mr. Chandler.

Bath Feb. 19. 17th.

Sir,

I Received yours on the 4th Instant, in which you tell me that my Letter of the 3d has not contributed in the least to your Satisfaction, so that (it should seem) the black Charge against King *Charles* I. of his being accessory to the *Irish* Massacre is still in possession of you, and is not, in your Opinion, sufficiently disproved. It would have been some satisfaction to me, had you told me what you will be pleased to allow as a sufficient Disproof of it, and what will give you any degree of Satisfaction in this Point. But instead of doing this (as I press'd you to do) you, without taking any Notice of what I urged, think it a sufficient Justification of that very hard Opinion you have entertained of King *Charles*, to refer me to (what you call) the Business of the Marquess of *Antrim*. This you do without telling me, that you'll be satisfied if I clear that matter, so that I am still at a loss to know what farther kind of disproof you expect, or when your Scruples will end.

However, to remove (if possible) your Prejudices, and to lay before you those Evidences and Reasons, which every rational and impartial Man must allow to be sufficient for Conviction. I shall add some Considerations to what I urged in my former, and then answer that Story which you lay so much stress upon in your last.

I have

I have already represented to you that the Charge has been never proved, that it is wanting both in external and intrinsic Evidence, that it is inconsistent with the King's Character and Conduct on many Accounts, and that the Rebels pretences to a Commission from him, have been in the most unexceptionable manner refuted by Sir *Phelim O'neal*. Let me now, to make those appear in a juster as well as clearer Light, desire you to consider whether *Fleetwood*, *Ludlow*, and the rest of that Factious Crew, who had a share in the Government of *Ireland* at the time of Sir *Phelim's* * Tryal (*Feb. 1652*) would ever have taken so base and execrable a Method to stain the King's Honour, and fasten that horrid charge upon him, had they had any real grounds for it, and whether their acting thus and their disappointment in the impious attempt, must not be looked upon by all sober and good Men, as an irrefragable proof of the King's Innocency, which notwithstanding all the Arts and Endeavours, the Promises and Threats, the Severities and Rewards, the Bribes and Temptations, which the Power and Wealth of the Nation could enable them to use, with the Persons they solicited to accuse him, could stand the Test of them all, and bear up with so glorious a success against the utmost Efforts and Assaults, that the most powerful Wickedness, Malice and Cunning could make against it. Had the King been indeed Guilty, less Industry, honest Methods, fewer Temptations, weaker Inducements would have proved his Guilt, whereas nothing but the purest Innocence, and best establish'd Truth, could stand firm in such Trials as this, and against all Attempts that such Enemies could make. It was the force of this Truth, which extorted not only from Sir *Phelim* in particular, but from the Rebels in general, from the Commanders as well as Fryars, a Confession that they had no Commission at all from the King, but (as Dr. * *Robert Maxwell* afterwards Bishop of *Kilmore* deposed upon Oath *Aug. 22. 1642*) that they thought it lawful to pretend what they could in Advancement of their Cause, and that in all Wars, Rumours and Lies served many times to as good purpose as Arms, and that they would not disclaim any Advantage. It

* Borlace p. 302, 304.

* Borlace Appendix. p. 126.

were desirous at any rate to have him amongst them for a Credit and Support to their Cause) complaining of his (the Marquess's) not taking up Arms, you may see others exclaiming against him so long as the *March* following at the end of the Year 1641, for that their Cause suffered by his Non-Concurrence. You may see him condemning the Bloodshed and Robbery which they had been guilty of, and which had even then spoiled their Business, and would be their Ruin. You may see others so imbitter'd against him, as to be for detaining him Prisoner, and crying out against the letting him go, after he had been taken by them. Nay, you may see them carrying their resentments so far against him as to say, he deserved to lose his Head, for saying (as he went thro' *Armagh* at the latter end of *April*, or beginning of *May*, 1642) that he saw nothing among them (the Rebels) but Desolation and execrable Cruelty, for which God's Wrath and the King's just Revenge hung over their Heads, and would speedily overtake them. What then did the Marquess Act in that Rebellion, which the Rebels exclaim'd against him for not joining in? What Hand could the Marquess have in that Massacre, which he so abhor'd, and was so free in expressing his Abhorrence of? Or with what Face, on what pretence can the King be charg'd with being accessory to it thro' a Commission given to the Marquess of *Antrim*, when that very Marquess declares, that his Majesty would speedily Revenge it, and his Justice would fall on the Heads of those that were guilty of it?

Nor are the other Accounts that we have of the Marquess in History inconsistent with these. For when the *Irish*, after they had in *March*, 1641, routed *Archibald Stewart*, animated with the success, invested *Colerain*, we find him using all the good Offices, (which either his Rank and Condition, Consanguinity or Religion could enable him to use with success) to engage them to raise the Siege, and not only doing so, but also sending Provisions, and other relief into the Town. And when the Protestant Army, on, or about *April* the 4th, 1642, came near *Killcullen*, the Marquess of *Antrim*, with the Dutchess of *Buckingham* his Lady, and the Earl of *Castle-Haven*, came in a
D Coach

Coach to visit the Marquess of *Ormond*, and were kindly received by him, and the whole Army passing by, saluted them.

This is a passage, seemingly of so small a Moment, that it would seem strange to have it expressly recorded in History, did not Sir *Robert Cox* (*Hibernia Anglicana*, part 2. chap. 1, p. 105. and in his *Apparatus*) tell us, his design in mentioning it, (*viz.*) To shew the Reader, that the Earl of *Castle-Haven* was not under any necessity of joining in the *Irish* Rebellion, but might have lived quietly at home, if he had pleas'd. Does not this give us reason to conclude that the latter was the Marquess's practice? For would not he that so carefully marks the Defection of *Castle-Haven*, have observed the same of *Antrim*, had he ever joined the Rebels afterwards, as it is certain he had not done before?

His Sentiments in the beginning of *May*, with regard to the Conduct of the Rebels, I have already shewn. And in *June* 1642, he delivered his strong Castle of *Dunluce* into the Hands of *Monroe*, General of the *Scotch* Forces, who confining his Person, he broke loose from his Restraint, and fled, not to the *Irish* Rebels, but (say the Parliament in their Declaration of *July* the 25th, 1643.) into the Northern Parts of *England*, and the Queen having landed at *Burlington*, in *February* 1642, and come from thence to *Tork*, he waited on her Majesty there.

About this time, in the beginning of the Year 1643, the Army in *Ireland*, under the Duke of *Ormond*, being reduced to unspeakable extremities of want of all things necessary to the support of their Persons, or Maintenance of the War, and no visible means of preserving the Remnant of the King's good Subjects in that Kingdom from utter Destruction. A Cessation of Arms with the *Irish* Rebels, became absolutely necessary, as you may see expressly asserted in the Lords Justices Letter to the King about the State of *Ireland*, *May* 11, 1643, and in Lord *Clarendon's* History, Vol. 2. Book 7, from p 319 to p. 337, and in the Opinion of all the Members of the Council of *Ireland*, given under their Hands, the Day that the Cessation was concluded.

This being the Condition of Affairs in that Kingdom, the King by his Letter of *April* the 23d, 1643. impowers the Duke of *Ormond* to Treat with the Rebels, and agree on a Cessation with

with them, giving farther Instructions likewise about it in his Letter of *May* the 3d.

To promote this work of the Cessation, the Marquis of *Antrim* is sent into *Ireland* by the Queen from *York*, with Letters and Instructions for this purpose. And his Pass, to go to *Dublin* and other Parts of the Kingdom, is signed by the Earl of *New-Castle*, *May* the 4th, 1643, which Pass, with the Letters aforesaid, were found in the Marquess's Pocket, when he was taken by *Monroe* (as the Parliament say in the Declaration aforementioned) in the County of *Down*, or as *Monroe's* Letter from *Carrickfergus*, (in the Castle whereof the Marquess was kept Prisoner) dated *May* 23, 1643. tells us more particularly, in a Bark coming from the Isle of *Man*, which Bark he had the good fortune to hawl as he lay before the Castle of *New-Castle*.

And that this was the Marquess's design, and the purpose of those Instructions which he had from the Queen, (the Parliament tells us) appears not only from the Confession of the Marquess himself, but from that likewise of his Servant, *Master Stewart* (who was taken with him) when they were both under Examination before General *Monroe* and the Council of War, *June* 12, 1643.

Sometime after this he got his Liberty, and coming into *England*, settled at *Oxford*. The Cessation was perfected and Signed *September* the 15th, 1643; and at the latter end of this Year, the Marquess of *Montross* coming to *Oxford*, and engaging to raise such a Party in *Scotland* for the King, as should oblige the *Scotch* Army to return out of *England*, if he had but some Troops to begin with, and to serve for a Protection to the Royalists that should join him. The Marquess of *Antrim* is sent to *Ireland* with *Daniel Oneal*, (a wise and faithful Servant of the King's, and a Protestant) with Instructions to draw a Body of Men out of that Kingdom, to serve as a foundation for *Montross's* raising Forces in *Scotland*. This Body was to be sent in *April*, 1644. But (as in the Execution of

D 2

Designs

† *Sir Robert Cox*, *Hiber. Ang. part 2. Chap. 1, p. 133.* * *Eorlace, p. 118.* † *p.*

Designs, unforeseen difficulties often arise to retard it) did not Land in the High Lands of *Scotland*, till about the end of *July* following. These Forces were in Number about 1500 (say *Clarendon* and other Historians) and were Commanded by *Alexander Mac Donnel*, Brother to the Marquess, and behaved themselves with the utmost bravery in all the daring Actions and amazing Victories, that *Montross* won against the Rebels in that Kingdom.

Whitlock (in his *Memoirs*, p. 93) says, these Forces were 2500, and makes the Marquess to be with them in Person, (p. 99,) and all along where-ever he mentions the Marquess, he still supposes him to be in *Scotland*, (see p. 225, 231, 232) even till the end of the Year 1646. But this Account of his seems not to be exact, since those who have given us the most distinct Relations of *Montross's* Actions in *Scotland*, take not the least notice of the Marquess of *Antrim's* being there. And yet all the Historians that we have to give us an Account of the Affairs of *Ireland*, are as entirely silent as to his being in that Kingdom. Nor have we any mention of him, till after the conclusion of the Peace, *March* the 28th, 1646. And therefore it would be very hard Treatment to charge him with any act of Rebellion in that time, since there is not the least ground for it, nor indeed can be, when we consider that the Cessation lasted all this while, and was continued from time to time, from *September* 15, 1643, till it ended in that Peace, which was concluded on *March* the 28th, and finally perfected, *July* the 30th, 1646.

And now as Sir *Robert Cox* (in his *Apparatus*) observes, Affairs took a new turn, and what passes after this, concerns not the Argument, and there is no pretence of the Marquess's acting by any Orders from the King.

However, to lay before you what History records of him, I find him sent into *France* by the General Assembly of *Kilkenny*, to the Queen and Prince, in *January* 1647, to desire a Lord Lieutenant might be sent over to them. They that went with the Marquess,

quefs, propofed and obtained of the Queen, that the Duke of *Ormond* might be the Man ſent over; tho' in this point, the Marquefs diſſented from and oppoſed them, there having been long an open and declared hatred between him and the Duke.

The Marquefs returns from *France* in *September*, and on the 29th of the ſame Month, 1648, the Duke of *Ormond* Lands at *Cork*, and in *November* goes to *Kilkenny* to Treat with the Supream Council about a Peace, which is concluded and ſigned *January* 17, 1648, the *Nuncio* declares againſt it, but is forced to fly the Kingdom, *February* 23d. However *Owen Oneal* and the Marquefs of *Antrim* adhere to him, and ſtand it out againſt the Peace which was concluded but 13 Days before King *Charles* was Murder'd in *England*, whoſe Orders therefore ſurely cannot be pretended for this great Conduct of the Marquefs.

His whole Conduct from this time is juſtly blameable, but it is as clear, that it cannot be imputed to King *Charles*, and that it was impoſſible for that Prince to give his Conſent and Inſtructions for it. For whether his Picque againſt the Duke of *Ormond*, or a deſire to ſave his Eſtate by Compliance with the *Regicides*, and meriting their favour, who had then all the Power of *England* in their Hands, and would ſoon, in all human appearance, reduce *Ireland*; Whether either of theſe were the motives of his Actions, 'tis certain, he not only ſtood out againſt the Peace with *Owen Oneal* (who was at laſt by *Daniel Oneal's* Interſt and Negotiation brought over to join the Duke of *Ormond*, *October* 2, 1649) but by means of his *Prieſt Kelly*, carry'd on an Intrigue with *Cromwell* from the time of his Landing, which was *Auguſt* 15, 1649, and from the time of the taking of *Rofs*, which was in the beginning of *October*, the Correſpondence became the more intimate and effectual, ſo that as Sir *Robert Cox* (*Hibernia Anglicana*, part 2. chap. 2. p. 55) ſays on *May* the 9th, 1650, his officious deſires to ſerve that Party, prevail'd with him to importune a Conference with Commiſſary General *Reynolds* and the Biſhop of *Clogher*, and afterwards with that Biſhop, and Collonel *Owen*. In which, tho' the deſign was to aſperſe the Memory of King *Charles* the 1ſt, and to juſtify and encourage his Enemies; and ſo *Ireton* underſtood it, as is
manifest

manifest from the favour and kindness he thereupon shewed to that Lord, yet when discoursing about a Commission being granted by the late King to the *Irish*, for their rising and acting as they had done in *Ireland*, on *October 23, 1641*, and after, the Marquess of *Antrim* said, that he knew nothing of any such Commission.

Not long after this Conference, *Antrim* had a Pass for going into *England*, and an Order from *Ireton* to go among his Tenants, and levy what Money he could for his Journey. By virtue whereof he raised 1000 *l.* and came to *Chester*, *December 3, 1650*, carrying with him likewise a Letter from *Ireton* to the Council of State, importing, that he the Marquess of *Antrim* had done the Parliament Army singular Service since the first Day they came before *Ross*, and so recommended him to their favour, to compound for his Estate (for which he had 9 Months time given him,) for 2 of which he was to be protected from all Suits, and the rather for that it did not appear, that he had an hand in the beginning of the Rebellion.

Having thus traced the Conduct of the Marquess of *Antrim*, thro' the whole Course of those Rebellious Times, it will help us to explain the several particulars contained in that Letter, which *Mr. Baxter* makes the great ground of the Charge against King *Charles* the 1st, and which he says King *Charles* the 2d, wrote to the Duke of *Ormond* and Council.

This Letter was wrote by King *Charles* the 2d's Order, *July* the 10th, is signed *Henry Bennet*, and passed the Signet Office, *July 13. 1663.* and is to be found at length in *Ludlow's Memoirs*, *vol. 3.* from *p. 353.* to *p. 357.*

In it we may observe King *Charles* the 2d's Averseness, to interpose in behalf of any, that by their Miscarriages in the late Rebellion in *Ireland*, had made themselves unworthy of his Grace and Protection; an Averseness that was notorious unto all Men, and particularly shewn in the Case of the Marquess of *Antrim*. We may observe his Jealousy in this Point so great, as only on a general Information of the Misbehaviour of the Marquess towards himself and his Father of blessed Memory, (the proof of which was deferr'd) to deny him Admission into his Presence,

Presence, and to Imprison him in the Tower of *London*, to continue him there under a strict Restraint for several Months, to send him afterwards to *Ireland* without interposing the least in his Behalf, and to leave him there to undergo such a Tryal and Punishment, as should by the Justice of the Kingdom be found due to his Crime.

We may likewise, whilst the King was expecting, that pursuant to the Information he had received, some heinous Matter would be objected and proved against him, see the Marquess after many Months attendance there, and 'tis to be presumed, after such Examinations as were requisite, dismiss'd without any Censure, without any transmission of Charge against him, and with a Licence to transport himself into *England*. These are all good Signs of the Marquess's Innocence, and make for him.

Nor does what follows in the Letter, give any just grounds for Mr. *Baxter's* uncharitable Inferences from it. It takes Notice of the Marquess's meriting by his former Actions the favour and protection of the King, and of the many Services he had done, and the Sufferings he had undergone for his Affection and Fidelity to the King's Royal Father and himself. Which Services were (as appears from History, from the very Letter before us, and from the Act which restored the Marquess to his Estate) his reducing the *Irish* to Obedience, drawing Forces from them to send to *Montross* in *Scotland*, and not only assisting King *Charles* the II^d. with Arms and Ammunition, whilst he was in the West, but also furnishing him with Ships to make his Escape into Forreign Parts, when his Armies were defeated in the West.

In a Sense of these Services, the King recommended to the Lord Lieutenant, to move the Council of *Ireland* for preparing a Bill to be transmitted over, for the re-investing the Marquess into the Possession of his Estate in that Kingdom.

The Lord Lieutenant and Council indeed (as appears from the Letter) were of Opinion, that such a Bill ought not to be transmitted. The Reasons of which Opinion, they give in their
Letter

Letter of *March* 18. which they sent over to the King, with a Petition from the Old Soldiers and Adventurers.

The equity of the Petition consisted only in this, that they had been peaceably possessed of the Marquess of *Antrim's* Estate for 7 or 8 Years, were very desirous to keep it longer, and should suffer if it was taken from them. And the Reasons of the Council were only, that they were inform'd, that he (the Marquess) had put in his Claim before the Commissioners appointed for executing the Act of Settlement, and that if he was by them adjudged Innocent, there was no need of the Bill, but if Nocent, it was not consistent with their Duty to transmit such a Bill, as if pass'd into a Law, would be a prejudice to so many Soldiers and Adventurers.

These Reasons (you see) charge nothing against the Marquess, and the Council only desire, that his Cause may be determined by the Commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement.

The King however causes all the Letters and Petitions sent to him to be examined by several Lords of the Privy Council, who, after a full Hearing of what could be alledged on both sides, make this Report, that they have seen several Letters, all of the Hand-writing of King *Charles* the 1st. to the said Marquess, and several Instructions concerning his treating and joining with the *Irish* in order to the King's Service, by reducing them to their Obedience, and by drawing Forces from them for the Service of *Scotland*. That (besides the Letters and Orders under his Majesty's Hand) they have receiv'd sufficient Evidence and Testimony, of several private Messages and Directions sent from King *Charles* the 1st, and from his Queen, with the Privy and Direction of the King her Husband, by which they are perswaded, that whatever Intelligence, Correspondence, or Actings the said Marquess had with the Confederate *Irish* Catholicks, was directed or allowed by the said Letters, Instructions and Directions, and that it manifestly appears to them, that King *Charles* the 1st was well pleased with what the Marquess did, after he had done it and approved the same.

This

were desirous at any rate to have him amongst them for a Credit and Support to their Cause) complaining of his (the Marquess's) not taking up Arms, you may see others exclaiming against him so long as the *March* following at the end of the Year 1641, for that their Cause suffered by his Non-Concurrence. You may see him condemning the Bloodshed and Robbery which they had been guilty of, and which had even then spoiled their Business, and would be their Ruin. You may see others so imbitter'd against him, as to be for detaining him Prisoner, and crying out against the letting him go, after he had been taken by them. Nay, you may see them carrying their resentments so far against him as to say, he deserved to lose his Head, for saying (as he went thro' *Armagh* at the latter end of *April*, or beginning of *May*, 1642) that he saw nothing among them (the Rebels) but Desolation and execrable Cruelty, for which God's Wrath and the King's just Revenge hung over their Heads, and would speedily overtake them. What then did the Marquess Act in that Rebellion, which the Rebels exclaim'd against him for not joining in? What Hand could the Marquess have in that Massacre, which he so abhor'd, and was so free in expressing his Abhorrence of? Or with what Face, on what pretence can the King be charg'd with being accessary to it thro' a Commission given to the Marquess of *Antrim*, when that very Marquess declares, that his Majesty would speedily Revenge it, and his Justice would fall on the Heads of those that were guilty of it?

Nor are the other Accounts that we have of the Marquess in History inconsistent with these. For when the *Irish*, after they had in *March*, 1641, routed *Archibald Stewart*, animated with the success, invested *Colerain*, we find him using all the good Offices, (which either his Rank and Condition, Consanguinity or Religion could enable him to use with success) to engage them to raise the Siege, and not only doing so, but also sending Provisions, and other relief into the Town. And when the Protestant Army, on, or about *April* the 4th, 1642, came near *Killcullen*, the Marquess of *Antrim*, with the Dutchess of *Buckingham* his Lady, and the Earl of *Castle-Haven*, came in a

Coach to visit the Marquess of Ormond, and were kindly received by him, and the whole Army passing by, saluted them.

This is a passage, seemingly of so small a Moment, that it would seem strange to have it expressly recorded in History, did not Sir Robert Cox (*Hibernia Anglicana*, part 2. chap. 1, p. 105. and in his *Apparatus*) tell us, his design in mentioning it, (*viz.*) To shew the Reader, that the Earl of Castle-Haven was not under any necessity of joining in the Irish Rebellion, but might have lived quietly at home, if he had pleas'd. Does not this give us reason to conclude that the latter was the Marquess's practice? For would not he that so carefully marks the Defection of Castle-Haven, have observed the same of Antrim, had he ever joined the Rebels afterwards, as it is certain he had not done before?

His Sentiments in the beginning of May, with regard to the Conduct of the Rebels, I have already shewn. And in June 1642, he delivered his strong Castle of Dunluce into the Hands of Monroe, General of the Scotch Forces, who confining his Person, he broke loose from his Restraint, and fled, not to the Irish Rebels, but (say the Parliament in their Declaration of July the 25th, 1643.) into the Northern Parts of England, and the Queen having landed at Burlington, in February 1642, and come from thence to York, he waited on her Majesty there.

About this time, in the beginning of the Year 1643, the Army in Ireland, under the Duke of Ormond, being reduced to unspeakable extremities of want of all things necessary to the support of their Persons, or Maintenance of the War, and no visible means of preserving the Remnant of the King's good Subjects in that Kingdom from utter Destruction. A Cessation of Arms with the Irish Rebels, became absolutely necessary, as you may see expressly asserted in the Lords Justices Letter to the King about the State of Ireland, May 11, 1643, and in Lord Clarendon's History, Vol. 2. Book 7, from p. 319 to p. 337, and in the Opinion of all the Members of the Council of Ireland, given under their Hands, the Day that the Cessation was concluded.

This being the Condition of Affairs in that Kingdom, the King by his Letter of April the 23d, 1643. impowers the Duke of Ormond to Treat with the Rebels, and agree on a Cessation with

with them, giving farther Instructions likewise about it in his Letter of *May* the 3d.

To promote this work of the Cessation, the Marquis of *Antrim* is sent into *Ireland* by the Queen from *York*, with Letters and Instructions for this purpose. And his Pass, to go to *Dublin* and other Parts of the Kingdom, is signed by the Earl of *New-Castle*, *May* the 4th, 1643, which Pass, with the Letters aforesaid, were found in the Marquess's Pocket, when he was taken by *Monroe* (as the Parliament say in the Declaration aforesaid) in the County of *Down*, or as *Monroe's* Letter from *Carrickfergus*, (in the Castle whereof the Marquess was kept Prisoner) dated *May* 23, 1643. tells us more particularly, in a Bark coming from the Isle of *Man*, which Bark he had the good fortune to hawl as he lay before the Castle of *New-Castle*.

And that this was the Marquess's design, and the purpose of those Instructions which he had from the Queen, (the Parliament tells us) appears not only from the Confession of the Marquess himself, but from that likewise of his Servant, *Master Stewart* (who was taken with him) when they were both under Examination before General *Monroe* and the Council of War, *June* 12, 1643.

Sometime after this he got his Liberty, and coming into *England*, settled at *Oxford*. The Cessation was perfected and Signed *September* the 15th, 1643; and at the latter end of this Year, the Marquess of *Montross* coming to *Oxford*, and engaging to raise such a Party in *Scotland* for the King, as should oblige the *Scotch* Army to return out of *England*, if he had but some Troops to begin with, and to serve for a Protection to the Royalists that should join him. The Marquess of *Antrim* is sent to *Ireland* with *Daniel Oneal*, (a wise and faithful Servant of the King's, and a Protestant) with Instructions to draw a Body of Men out of that Kingdom, to serve as a foundation for *Montross's* raising Forces in *Scotland*. This Body was to be sent in *April*, 1644. But (as in the Execution of

D 2

Designs

† Sir Robert Cox, *Hiber. Ang. part 2. Chap. 1, p. 133.* * Borlace, p. 118. † p. 111.

Designs, unforeseen difficulties often arise to retard it) did not Land in the High Lands of Scotland, till about the end of July following. These Forces were in Number about 1500 (say Clarendon and other Historians) and were Commanded by Alexander Mac Donnel, Brother to the Marquess, and behaved themselves with the utmost bravery in all the daring Actions and amazing Victories, that Montross won against the Rebels in that Kingdom.

Whitlock (in his Memoirs, p. 93) says, these Forces were 2500, and makes the Marquess to be with them in Person, (p. 99,) and all along where-ever he mentions the Marquess, he still supposes him to be in Scotland, (see p. 225, 231, 232) even till the end of the Year 1646. But this Account of his seems not to be exact, since those who have given us the most distinct Relations of Montross's Actions in Scotland, take not the least notice of the Marquess of Antrim's being there. And yet all the Historians that we have to give us an Account of the Affairs of Ireland, are as entirely silent as to his being in that Kingdom. Nor have we any mention of him, till after the conclusion of the Peace, March the 28th, 1646. And therefore it would be very hard Treatment to charge him with any act of Rebellion in that time, since there is not the least ground for it, nor indeed can be, when we consider that the Cessation lasted all this while, and was continued from time to time, from September 15, 1643, till it ended in that Peace, which was concluded on March the 28th, and finally perfected, July the 30th, 1646.

And now as Sir Robert Cox (in his Apparatus) observes, Affairs took a new turn, and what passes after this, concerns not the Argument, and there is no pretence of the Marquess's acting by any Orders from the King.

However, to lay before you what History records of him, I find him sent into France by the General Assembly of Kilkenny, to the Queen and Prince, in January 1647, to desire a Lord Lieutenant might be sent over to them. They that went with the Marquess,

† Borlase, p. 199 Hib. Ang. Cha. 1. p. 201.

quests, proposed and obtained of the Queen, that the Duke of *Ormond* might be the Man sent over; tho' in this point, the Mar-
 quests dissented from and opposed them, there having been long
 an open and declared hatred between him and the Duke.

The Marquess returns from *France* in *September*, and on the
 29th of the same Month, 1648, the Duke of *Ormond* Lands
 at *Cork*, and in *November* goes to *Kilkenny* to Treat with the
 Supream Council about a Peace, which is concluded and signed
January 17, 1648, the *Nuncio* declares against it, but is forced
 to fly the Kingdom, *February* 23d. However *Owen Oneal* and the
 Marquess of *Antrim* adhere to him, and stand it out against the
 Peace which was concluded but 13 Days before King *Charles*
 was Murder'd in *England*, whose Orders therefore surely can-
 not be pretended for this great Conduct of the Marquess.

His whole Conduct from this time is justly blameable, but it
 is as clear, that it cannot be imputed to King *Charles*, and that
 it was impossible for that Prince to give his Consent and Instru-
 ctions for it. For whether his Picque against the Duke of *Or-*
mond, or a desire to save his Estate by Compliance with the
Regicides, and meriting their favour, who had then all the Power
 of *England* in their Hands, and would soon, in all human
 appearance, reduce *Ireland*; Whether either of these were the
 motives of his Actions, 'tis certain, he not only stood out a-
 gainst the Peace with *Owen Oneal* (who was at last by *Daniel*
Oneal's Interest and Negotiation brought over to join the Duke
 of *Ormond*, *October* 2, 1649) but by means of his Priest *Kelly*,
 carry'd on an Intrigue with *Cromwell* from the time of his Land-
 ing, which was *August* 15, 1649, and from the time of the
 taking of *Ross*, which was in the beginning of *October*, the Cor-
 respondence became the more intimate and effectual, so that as
 Sir *Robert Cox* (*Hibernia Anglicana*, part 2. chap. 2. p. 55) says
 on *May* the 9th, 1650, his officious desires to serve that Party,
 prevail'd with him to importune a Conference with Commissa-
 ry General *Reynolds* and the Bishop of *Clogher*, and afterwards
 with that Bishop, and Collonel *Owen*. In which, tho' the design
 was to asperse the Memory of King *Charles* the 1st, and to justify
 and encourage his Enemies; and so *Ireton* understood it, as is
 manifest

manifest from the favour and kindness he thereupon shewed to that Lord, yet when discoursing about a Commission being granted by the late King to the *Irish*, for their rising and acting as they had done in *Ireland*, on *October 23, 1641*, and after, the Marquess of *Antrim* said, that he knew nothing of any such Commission.

Not long after this Conference, *Antrim* had a Pass for going into *England*, and an Order from *Ireton* to go among his Tenants, and levy what Money he could for his Journey. By virtue whereof he raised 1000 *l.* and came to *Chester*, *December 3, 1650*, carrying with him likewise a Letter from *Ireton* to the Council of State, importing, that he the Marquess of *Antrim* had done the Parliament Army singular Service since the first Day they came before *Ross*, and so recommended him to their favour, to compound for his Estate (for which he had 9 Months time given him,) for 2 of which he was to be protected from all Suits, and the rather for that it did not appear, that he had an hand in the beginning of the Rebellion.

Having thus traced the Conduct of the Marquess of *Antrim*, thro' the whole Course of those Rebellious Times, it will help us to explain the several particulars contained in that Letter, which *Mr. Baxter* makes the great ground of the Charge against King *Charles* the 1st, and which he says King *Charles* the 2d, wrote to the Duke of *Ormond* and Council.

This Letter was wrote by King *Charles* the 2d's Order, *July* the 10th, is signed *Henry Bennet*, and passed the Signet Office, *July 13. 1663.* and is to be found at length in *Ludlow's Memoirs*, vol. 3. from p. 353. to p. 357.

In it we may observe King *Charles* the 2d's Averseness, to interpose in behalf of any, that by their Miscarriages in the late Rebellion in *Ireland*, had made themselves unworthy of his Grace and Protection; an Averseness that was notorious unto all Men, and particularly shewn in the Case of the Marquess of *Antrim*. We may observe his Jealousy in this Point so great, as only on a general Information of the Misbehaviour of the Marquess towards himself and his Father of blessed Memory, (the proof of which was deferr'd) to deny him Admission into his Presence,

Presence, and to Imprison him in the Tower of *London*, to continue him there under a strict Restraint for several Months, to send him afterwards to *Ireland* without interposing the least in his Behalf, and to leave him there to undergo such a Tryal and Punishment, as should by the Justice of the Kingdom be found due to his Crime.

We may likewise, whilst the King was expecting, that pursuant to the Information he had received, some heinous Matter would be objected and proved against him, see the Marquess after many Months attendance there, and 'tis to be presumed, after such Examinations as were requisite, dismiss'd without any Censure, without any transmission of Charge against him, and with a Licence to transport himself into *England*. These are all good Signs of the Marquess's Innocence, and make for him.

Nor does what follows in the Letter, give any just grounds for Mr. *Baxter's* uncharitable Inferences from it. It takes Notice of the Marquess's meriting by his former Actions the favour and protection of the King, and of the many Services he had done, and the Sufferings he had undergone for his Affection and Fidelity to the King's Royal Father and himself. Which Services were (as appears from History, from the very Letter before us, and from the Act which restored the Marquess to his Estate) his reducing the *Irish* to Obedience, drawing Forces from them to send to *Montross* in *Scotland*, and not only assisting King *Charles* the II^d. with Arms and Ammunition, whilst he was in the West, but also furnishing him with Ships to make his Escape into Foreign Parts, when his Armies were defeated in the West.

In a Sense of these Services, the King recommended to the Lord Lieutenant, to move the Council of *Ireland* for preparing a Bill to be transmitted over, for the re-investing the Marquess into the Possession of his Estate in that Kingdom.

The Lord Lieutenant and Council indeed (as appears from the Letter) were of Opinion, that such a Bill ought not to be transmitted. The Reasons of which Opinion, they give in their Letter

manifest from the favour and kindness he thereupon shewed to that Lord, yet when discoursing about a Commission being granted by the late King to the *Irish*, for their rising and acting as they had done in *Ireland*, on *October 23, 1641*, and after, the Marquess of *Antrim* said, that he knew nothing of any such Commission.

Not long after this Conference, *Antrim* had a Pass for going into *England*, and an Order from *Ireton* to go among his Tenants, and levy what Money he could for his Journey. By virtue whereof he raised 1000 *l.* and came to *Chester*, *December 3, 1650*, carrying with him likewise a Letter from *Ireton* to the Council of State, importing, that he the Marquess of *Antrim* had done the Parliament Army singular Service since the first Day they came before *Ross*, and so recommended him to their favour, to compound for his Estate (for which he had 9 Months time given him,) for 2 of which he was to be protected from all Suits, and the rather for that it did not appear, that he had an hand in the beginning of the Rebellion.

Having thus traced the Conduct of the Marquess of *Antrim*, thro' the whole Course of those Rebellious Times, it will help us to explain the several particulars contained in that Letter, which Mr. *Baxter* makes the great ground of the Charge against King *Charles* the 1st, and which he says King *Charles* the 2d, wrote to the Duke of *Ormond* and Council.

This Letter was wrote by King *Charles* the 2d's Order, *July* the 10th, is signed *Henry Bennet*, and passed the Signet Office, *July 13. 1663.* and is to be found at length in *Ludlow's Memoirs*, vol. 3. from p. 353. to p. 357.

In it we may observe King *Charles* the 2d's Averseness, to interpose in behalf of any, that by their Miscarriages in the late Rebellion in *Ireland*, had made themselves unworthy of his Grace and Protection; an Averseness that was notorious unto all Men, and particularly shewn in the Case of the Marquess of *Antrim*. We may observe his Jealousy in this Point so great, as only on a general Information of the Misbehaviour of the Marquess towards himself and his Father of blessed Memory, (the proof of which was deferr'd) to deny him Admission into his Presence,

Presence, and to Imprison him in the Tower of *London*, to continue him there under a strict Restraint for several Months, to send him afterwards to *Ireland* without interposing the least in his Behalf, and to leave him there to undergo such a Tryal and Punishment, as should by the Justice of the Kingdom be found due to his Crime.

We may likewise, whilst the King was expecting, that pursuant to the Information he had received, some heinous Matter would be objected and proved against him, see the Marquess after many Months attendance there, and 'tis to be presumed, after such Examinations as were requisite, dismiss'd without any Censure, without any transmission of Charge against him, and with a Licence to transport himself into *England*. These are all good Signs of the Marquess's Innocence, and make for him.

Nor does what follows in the Letter, give any just grounds for Mr. *Baxter's* uncharitable Inferences from it. It takes Notice of the Marquess's meriting by his former Actions the favour and protection of the King, and of the many Services he had done, and the Sufferings he had undergone for his Affection and Fidelity to the King's Royal Father and himself. Which Services were (as appears from History, from the very Letter before us, and from the Act which restored the Marquess to his Estate) his reducing the *Irish* to Obedience, drawing Forces from them to send to *Montross* in *Scotland*, and not only assisting King *Charles* the II^d. with Arms and Ammunition, whilst he was in the West, but also furnishing him with Ships to make his Escape into Foreign Parts, when his Armies were defeated in the West.

In a Sense of these Services, the King recommended to the Lord Lieutenant, to move the Council of *Ireland* for preparing a Bill to be transmitted over, for the re-investing the Marquess into the Possession of his Estate in that Kingdom.

The Lord Lieutenant and Council indeed (as appears from the Letter) were of Opinion, that such a Bill ought not to be transmitted. The Reasons of which Opinion, they give in their Letter.

Letter of *March* 18. which they sent over to the King, with a Petition from the Old Soldiers and Adventurers.

The equity of the Petition consisted only in this, that they had been peaceably possessed of the Marquess of *Antrim's* Estate for 7 or 8 Years, were very desirous to keep it longer, and should suffer if it was taken from them. And the Reasons of the Council were only, that they were inform'd, that he (the Marquess) had put in his Claim before the Commissioners appointed for executing the Act of Settlement, and that if he was by them adjudged Innocent, there was no need of the Bill, but if Nocent, it was not consistent with their Duty to transmit such a Bill, as if pass'd into a Law, would be a prejudice to so many Soldiers and Adventurers.

These Reasons (you see) charge nothing against the Marquess, and the Council only desire, that his Cause may be determined by the Commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement.

The King however causes all the Letters and Petitions sent to him to be examined by several Lords of the Privy Council, who, after a full Hearing of what could be alledged on both sides, make this Report, that they have seen several Letters, all of the Hand-writing of King *Charles* the 1st. to the said Marquess, and several Instructions concerning his treating and joining with the *Irish* in order to the King's Service, by reducing them to their Obedience, and by drawing Forces from them for the Service of *Scotland*. That (besides the Letters and Orders under his Majesty's Hand) they have receiv'd sufficient Evidence and Testimony, of several private Messages and Directions sent from King *Charles* the 1st, and from his Queen, with the Privy and Direction of the King her Husband, by which they are perswaded, that whatever Intelligence, Correspondence, or Actings the said Marquess had with the Confederate *Irish* Catholicks, was directed or allowed by the said Letters, Instructions and Directions, and that it manifestly appears to them, that King *Charles* the 1st was well pleased with what the Marquess did, after he had done it and approved the same.

This

This is the Passage of the Letter and the Report of the Members of the Council which Mr. *Baxter* founds his Charge against King *Charles* the 1st upon, and with Regard to which Report the King declares at the End of the Letter, that he cannot but in Justice, and after a strict Disquisition into the Actions of the Marquess, declare, that he finds him Innocent from any Malice or Rebellious Purpose against the Crown; and that what he did by way of Correspondence or Compliance with the *Irish* Rebels was in order to the Service of his Royal Father, and warranted by his Instructions and the Trust reposed in him; and that the Benefit thereof accrewed to the Service of the Crown, and not to the particular Benefit and Advantage of the Marquess. And the whole plainly relates to the Correspondence and Actings, which the Marquess had with the Rebels, in order to get Forces for *Montross's* Assistance, or to make a Peace, or at least a Cessation with them, which was then absolutely necessary for the Preservation of the King's Army in *Ireland*, and the security of his good Subjects there, as I have observed before, and may be seen likewise in the King's Motives to a Cessation published *October 19. 1643.*

And the Letter so expressly tells us, this to be the end of all the King's Instructions, and the Marquess's Correspondence, that Mr. *Baxter*, did he not read this Letter with the blindest prejudice, or were he not resolved to prevent its true meaning, must see it.

But so fair, so just a Construction would not serve his Purpose. No Body could blame the King for making a Cessation so necessary for him in the Circumstances his Affairs were then in: Or for endeavouring to rid his Hands of one Enemy in *Ireland*, so that he might draw his Forces thence to assist him against other more powerful and dangerous, and not less implacable Enemies in *England*. (as he did, see *Borlace History* p. 139) and to procure others to be sent to *Scotland*.

And if he gave any Body Orders or Instructions for Treating with them for this end, every one must see that this could be no more called giving a Commission to the *Irish* Rebels than his empowering others to Treat with the *English* Rebels at *Uxbridge*

bridge, could be called a giving them a Commission to fight against him, or an authorising their Rebellion. Nor could the Marquess in Justice be stiled a Rebel, for treating and corresponding with the *Irish* in order to a Peace, any more than those whom the King empower'd in *England* for the like purpose were: And therefore Mr. Baxter, to blacken the King, and render him as odious as possible, makes the Marquess to be concerned in the beginning of the Rebellion at the time of the Massacre, and insinuates, that the King's Instructions related to his Actings then, contrary to the Words and Sense of the Letter, contrary also to the Accounts which the Histories of those Times give us of the Marquess's Conduct, which (as I have traced it) appears to be such as shews, that the Instructions from the Queen (mention'd in the Letter of *July 10, 1663*) were given to the Marquess at the beginning of the Year 1643, as those from the King were at the end of the same Year.

And that these were those very Instructions and no other, appears undeniably (to the full satisfaction of all that reverence the Royal Martyr's Memory, and the Confusion of those who impiously load it with such heavy Calumnies) from King *Charles II's* own Words, deliver'd on this very Subject of the Letter, in the most authentick manner, in an Act of Parliament (*Anno 17 & 18 Car. 2.*) in the 2d Act about the *Irish* forfeited Estates, and which I think, is the same with that called the Act of Explanation pass'd *Dec. 15. 1665.* in which he declares, that the Testimony of the Marquess of *Antrim's* Innocence, which he had given in that Letter of *July 16. 1663*, and which at the end of that Letter, the Duke of *Ormond* and Council are required to transmit to the Commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement, for them to regulate their Proceedings by, was only to declare, that the Marquess of *Antrim* was employed in *Ireland*, to procure what Forces he could from thence, to be transported into *Scotland* for his late Majesty's Service, under the late Marquess of *Montrose*, to the end, that the Conversation of the said Marquess of *Antrim* in the Rebels Quarters, which was necessary for that Service, might not, according to the Letter of the former Act, render him Criminal: These are the Words of that Act of Parliament

Parliament, and is it possible for any thing more clearly to shew what the King's Instructions, and what the Marquess of *Antrim's* Correspondence and Actings pursuant thereto were? Do they not appear to be perfectly Innocent? And what then has Mr. *Baxter* to Answer for, for representing them otherwise?

I shall only observe one thing farther, (*viz.*) that by the first Act of Settlement, those that join'd with the Nuncio and opposed the Peace of 1646, or that of 1648, forfeited their Estates. And as the Marquess by his Conduct in that Point (which I have represented before) had, according to the Letter of that Act, forfeited his: The Council of *Ireland* (who on all occasions seem to favour the Cause of the Adventurers) in their Letter of July 31, 1663, desirous to keep the Marquess from his Estate, and having nothing else to charge him with, insist on that Clause in the Act, and the Marquess's Conduct in that particular, and represent to the King, that if the Marquess was restored to his Estate and adjudged Innocent, it would infringe the Act of the Settlement, which was the very foundation of the Kingdom's Peace and Quiet. The King therefore sensible of the Inconveniencies of breaking through that Act, and of a Precedent of that kind in the Court of Claims (that Court having adjudged the Marquess Innocent, though Condemn'd by the Letter of the Act) thought fit by the Act of Explanation to provide for the Security of the Adventurers in general, and as the Marquess's particular Case was entitled to his Compassion and Favour, to provide likewise for his Relief, by repealing at once the Judgment of the Court of Claims in his favour, and restoring him to his Estate by that Act.

And as for that other Story in Mr. *Baxter*, about the Lord *Mazarine's* and others, prosecuting the Cause so far, as that the Marquess of *Antrim* was forced to produce in the Parliament of *England*, in the House of Commons, a Letter of King *Charles I.* by which he gave him Order for his taking up Arms; if this Letter of the King's was one of those produced before the Lords Referees of the Council, it has been already considered and cleared, and as it relates only to the Marquess's drawing Forces out of *Ireland* for the Service of *Scotland*; the King

can be no more blameable for giving the Marquess of *Antrim* such Order, than for giving one to the Marquess of *Montrose* for the like purpose and for the same Service: But then this does not serve the purpose of those who quote this Letter, and does not in the least support the Charge they lay against the King.

And yet, if it is pretended, that it is none of those which were laid before the Lords of the Council, it will be hard to account how the Marquess came not to produce it before them for his fuller Vindication: A Man, all whose Fortune depends on his being able to clear or justify his Conduct, is very rarely shy of producing what is necessary for that end; and this and other Circumstances about the Letter, give us just grounds to suspect the Story, and (till we see better Reason to credit it) to look upon it as one of those Lies, which that Faction (whose Rebellion subverted our Constitution, and to whose Malice the King himself fell a Sacrifice) have never scrupled to raise, and to assert with Confidence, whenever they thereby could serve the Interests of their Cause, a Cause indeed that needed them and could not be supported otherwise.

That the Lord *Mazarine* should Petition against the Marquess, is no wonder; he had part of his Estate, and was desirous to keep it. And though he and Sir *John Clotworthy* (whose Daughter and Heiress he had Married) had been engaged with the Faction in those Times, and he then actually enjoyed the Plunder of one of the King's Palaces, yet considering the usual Modesty of the Party, which was so egregious, as hardly ever to suffer them to beg Pardon of the King for their Rebellion, or shew a sense of Shame for what they had acted against him; we have no reason to be surpriz'd at that Lords Petitioning, that he might be still allowed to retain what of the Marquess of *Antrim's* Estate he was possessed of.

But that he should Petition the Parliament of *England*, and bring the Cause before the House of Commons here, is a point that may well be question'd. I cannot find it in any Account but what Mr. *Baxter* refers us to, so that (for ought appears) it stands upon the single Authority of the Writer of the Pamphlet called *Murder will out*; an Authority too wretched and incon-

inconsiderable to give Weight and Credit to the veriest Trifle in this Dispute.

The Act of Explanation which restored the Marquess to his Estate, and which passed Dec. 15, 1665, mentions a solemn Hearing before his Majesty at the Council Board in *England*, and upon a Petition exhibited by several Adventurers and Soldiers (of which in all probability the Lord *Mazarine* was one) against the Marquess, and the Judgment and Decree of the Court of Claims in his favour, but gives not the least hint of any Petition presented in the Parliament of *England*, which surely it would have done, had any been then presented; and it would be too late to present any afterwards, when the King had by Act of Parliament restored the Marquess to his Estate, and thereby put an end to all Disputes about it.

And indeed the Council was the proper Court for the Petitioners to apply to, whereas the *English* Parliament meddled not in the Settlement of *Ireland*. Yet the Story makes them apply to a Court before whom the Cognizance of their Cause did not properly lie, and says, that their Petition was presented, but without telling us when. 'Tis dangerous to fix a time for some Facts, it might discover their falshood, and therefore it is waved in this Case; and those who are willing to beleive the Charge against King *Charles*, are left to imagine, this Petition presented some time or other, they know not when, to beleive a matter of Fact without any just proof or credible testimonial of it.

And as to the Letter said to be produc'd on occasion of this Petition, we are told, that the Original of it was once (as Dr. *Calamy* was informed) in the Paper Office, but now it is we know not where. The time of its being wrote we are not made acquainted with, and must be therefore at a loss about the Date of it, as well as about that part of the Marquess's Conduct, which he produced it to justify. This looks very suspicious indeed, but what more directly proves the falshood of the Letter, or the Representation made of it is, That it is quoted for justifying a Man for doing what he never did, (as you see by the Marquess's Conduct before related) and for
giving

giving the Marquess a Commission to take up Arms in the *Irish* Rebellion, which the Marquess himself knew nothing of, and which he was so far from pretending to or counterfeiting, that (when he was most desirous to curry favour with the *English* Rebels, at whose Mercy he lay, and to whom he could not possibly recommend himself, more than by accusing the King in this point) he utterly disavows all knowledge of any Commission whatever given to the *Irish* for taking Arms; as he does expressly in his Conference before quoted, which he confirmed the truth of and attested under his Hand, Aug. 22, 1650.

And is not this a fine Story to ground one of the blackest Charges in Nature against King *Charles* upon! A Story that is attended with such suspicions and inconsistencies, and is palmed upon us without a Witness to attest it, (for an unknown one is none at all) and stands only on the no Credit of the uncertain Author of a scandalous Pamphlet, * who might, for ought Dr. *Calamy* knows) be the Author also of the Letter he makes the Marquess of *Antrim* to produce, and be guilty of an horrid Imposition on the World, by representing it otherwise, and putting it to a different purpose than it really served to, and who was certainly of a Party of Men of the same Principles with those, who loaded King *Charles*, when alive, with so many and horrid Lyes, and who would not therefore much scruple aspersing his Memory when Dead, if the doing so would advance the Interests of their Cause: A Cause which they promoted by the most abominable Forgeries that ever Men were guilty of, and by the very common but villanous practice of counterfeiting Authors, forging Papers, Letters and Petitions, and then imposing them upon the World for genuine, of which practice of theirs you may see several Instances in Mr. *Wagstaff's* excellent Vindication of King *Charles* the Martyr's Title to the *Εικὼν Βασιλική*, Printed 1711, from p. 116. to p. 132. and p. 12, 13, and in the Earl of *Clarendon's* History.

And

* *Abridgment* of *B xie's* *Life*, p. 44.

And now, Sir, to consider briefly Mr. *Baxter's* Conduct and manner of expressing his Sentiments in the Case before us. We may observe with what a Sneer, he mentions (what he calls) the egregious Loyalty and Veneration of Majesty in the House of Commons, which was such, that the Letter produced before them, put them not at all one step out of the way which they had gone in.

It seems, it did not alter their Sentiments of the King, they still thought (because they knew) him to be Innocent of this Charge : For whatever Mr. *Baxter* may think of the Sense and Conduct of the Royalists in this point, their Judgment and Testimony are not to be laughed at, but will with unprejudiced Men have their weight, and be allowed as no inconsiderable Vindication of him.

For who could know the King's Innocence or Guilt so well as they ? They were the Men that were about him constantly ; they knew his Councils, his Secrets, his Actings and Proceedings ; they were privy to all his Affairs, were consulted in all the Measures that he took, were necessary to the carrying on of any of his Designs, and best knew the real Sense of his Heart ; and if they who were best able to judge of and had the greatest of knowing his Mind and Actions ; if they cleared the King from this Charge. is it for those who had no such opportunities, no such means of knowing them, to dare to accuse him of it ?

And as for those without Doors, we know that there is nothing so absurd, so unreasonable and malicious, but some of them will say it ; and we know as well a Writer's meaning that quotes their seditious Speeches ; they are a very convenient sort of Creatures for an Author's purpose ; for when he has a mind to say things he dare not own, 'tis but putting it into their Mouths, and he gratifies his Malice without the hazard of his Credit, whilst he would be thought to relate other People's Sentiments and not his own ; but the Artifice is grown stale and common, every one sees through it, and whosoever the Words are, we know whose Sense they speak.

Now what these are brought in for, is to insinuate, That the King was not against the *Irish* Rebellion: But how can this be imagined? Was not that Rebellion the ruin of his Affairs? Was it not inconsistent with every part of his Character? Did he not on all occasions, and with the most pathetical and vehement Expressions declare, and in all his Conduct shew his abhorrence of it? And can any honest or good Man suspect him of Insincerity? No, Men generally judge of others by themselves, and it is not so very strange, that a Race of Men all whose Professions, whose most solemn Appeals to God for the sincerity of their Promises to make him a glorious King, were false and hypocritical, or those who inherit their Principles, are engaged in the same Cause, and tread in the same Steps, should suspect him to be so likewise: But that they should this, without Evidence to support their suspicions, in opposition to his nearest Interests, against the whole tenour of his Actions, and all the Reason of Things. This must raise, if not the wonder, at least the indignation of every fair and impartial Person.

With what pretence to Reason can Mr. *Baxter* make any to suggest, that the Rebels did not belie the King, when they said, that they had his Warrant or Commission? Were not all the Interest of the *Irish*, and all the Malice and Power of the *English* Rebels, too weak to shew that any Commission was given them? Did not Sir *Phelim Oneal*, the Head of that Rebellion, under the greatest Tryals and with his dying Words, clear him from this Charge? Did not the Rebels in general own, that their pretence to it was a Lie? Did they not in a Body wave all pretensions to a Commission, and acknowledge the King's abhorrence of their Rebellion? Does not the Marquess of *Antrim* also expressly clear him, and declare, that he knew not of any Commission ever given to the *Irish*? Was ever Innocence better proved? Can any thing be added to set it in a better Light, or to expose more shamefully the Malice of those who revive the Calumny?

Nor is the next Insinuation less malicious and unjust, (*viz.*) as if the King with a treacherous Mind, had offered to go himself with an Army into *Ireland* to fight against them.

His Virtues, and particularly his Integrity, were too bright and manifest to all the World, to be tarnished with the base Suspicions of his Enemies: Treachery never made any part of his Character, never appeared in any one Action of his, but was notoriously the main Ingredient in the Composition of his Enemies, and was used by them in the whole course of their Conduct, so that for them to accuse him of Treachery was the highest Impudence, as their Accusation was the basest Slander.

And as for those Wishes, which Mr. *Baxter* puts upon those that were still Loyal to the King, *viz.* That King *Charles. II.* had rather declared (*viz.* in the Letter of *July* the 10th) That his Father did only give the Marquess of *Antrim* Commission to raise an Army, as to have helped him against the *Scots*. What need of this Wish, when King *Charles II.* has plainly done it, as I have shewn in the Examination of that Letter? Or of the other Wish, that his (the Marquess's) turning against the *English* Protestants in *Ireland*, and the Murdering so many hundred thousands, had been declared to have been against his (King *Charles's*) Will? And what need likewise of that solemn Addition, containing in it a vile Insinuation and Charge, which we have in these Words? But *quod scriptum erat, scriptum erat.*

For a Man to charge the Marquess of *Antrim* with being concerned in the beginning of the Rebellion, and with having an hand in the Murder of so many hundred thousand Protestants, and this without a single Fact in History to support the Charge against the Confessions and Exclamations of the Rebels, against the express Testimony of *Ireton* in his behalf, is certainly a Wickedness of very heinous Nature.

To do this, and to wrest the Words of a Letter, in order to stain the Honour of one of the best Princes that ever filled a Throne, and to impute an Impiety of such a Nature to a Prince of admirable Virtues, a Prince who had been dead for

many Years, who as he had led a Life full of Sorrows and embitter'd with the heaviest Calamities, died also in such Circumstances as must move the Compassion of all that have any Humanity in them, and might (one would think) melt the Heart even of his most cruel Enemies, he being Murder'd before his own Palace, in all the Pomp of a Triumph, by the most barbarous Rebels under the Sun, and to treat him in this manner, to pursue him even beyond Death, and not let his Ashes to rest in Peace, but to call him from the Grave, to Arraign him afresh, and Murder him in his Memory, has in it all the Circumstances of Baseness.

To do this, and to lay upon him a Charge, in its Nature inhumane, in its Circumstances incredible, without all intrinsic or outward Evidence, inconsistent with the King's Character, contrary to his publick Acts, to his constant Professions, to his repeated and vehement Declarations of abhorrence, his solemn Appeals to God, his whole Conduct and Actions, his Offers, his Religion and his very Interest, against the Testimony of all that were about his Person, and of all the Historians who have wrote of those Times, of Friends and Enemies, of Rebels as well as Subjects, *i. e.* against all the Evidence that the Nature of the Thing will admit of, and in spite of 10000 Absurdities and Contradictions, is a practice so full of horror, an iniquity of such a size, as I want Words to express its just demerit. And yet this is what Mr. *Baxter* has done, with what Conscience let all indifferent People judge, with what End is plain from his own Words, after his false Accusation of the Marquess of *Antrim* and vile perverting of King *Charles II's* Words and Meaning in his Letter. Upon this (says Mr. *Baxter*) the Parliaments old Adherents grew more Confident than ever (they were always Confident, and among these Mr. *Baxter*, but now more than ever) of the Righteousness of their Wars, and the very Destroyers of the King, whom the first Parliamentarians called *Rebels*, did presume also to justify their Cause, and said, that the Law of Nature did warrant them.

Here

Here we see the End of horrid Slander on the King, and the Use to be made of it, (*viz.*) to lessen the horror of his Martyrdom, to shew the Righteousness of the most unnatural and inexcusable Rebellion that was ever raised, and to justify even the Cause of the Regicides.

Such Causes indeed are not to be carried on but by such vile Methods, by a succession of such Calumnies, as have been thrown on the blessed Martyr: But to joyn in these Methods, and to propagate these Calumnies, whatever Policy there be in it, has certainly in it abundance of Impiety.

But as bad as it is, it is one degree less execrable than the calling upon Providence to justify it, and to Father the horribly unjust and scandalous Aspersions thrown on the King. And yet Dr. *Calamy* (in his Abridgment of Mr. *Baxter's* Life, p. 43. Edit. 1713.) imputes the Discovery of it to Providence, and says, That, as Providence order'd it, a certain memorable Particularity (*viz.*) The Story of the Marquess of *Antrim*, (which I have refuted) help'd to set this matter in a just light, *i. e.* (as he thinks) to shew that King *Charles* was guilty of the Charge. The falshood of this I have shewn already, and shall only observe farther, that to make Providence order the publishing of a Story, whose weight is owing only to downright Falshoods, or unfair Representations of the Sense of Words, for so base an End, is treading in the Steps of the Rebels of 1648; the Regicides of those days, we know, called upon God to warrant the Murdering of their King in his Person, as Dr. *Calamy* does for the Murdering of him in his Memory.

This is a Point, in which Dr. *Calamy* can't call upon Mr. *Baxter* to Patronize him in, as he does for quoting the Story of the Marquess of *Antrim* from him. But is there not the same Reason and Conscience to keep a Man from spreading as from raising a Lye? Is it not a very poor Excuse for the Injury done to the Royal Martyr's Honour, by publishing a notorious Calumny of him, for a Man to say he transcribes it from another, and therefore is not to Answer for it? Dr. *Calamy* should know better what a Man owes to Truth and Justice

stice, and that he who spreads a Lye, does by that Act adopt it for his own, becomes a Party to it, and makes it his own Act and Deed, and must answer for his Publishing, as well as the Author for his Inventing it.

And as for your own Conduct in this Dispute : That a Man at this time should dare to load the Memory of the Royal Martyr with so horrid a Slander : That this should be done by you, who have generally passed for a fairer and more moderate Man than most of your Sect, is what I am sorry, as others are surprized to find, and may teach us how to judge of others of the same Party of Men, who have more Warmth in their Nature, and less Caution in their Conduct : That you should do this in the publick manner that you did, should spread your first Letter with so much Diligence, so much Ostentation, as to place it in the Shops of this Town to be distributed about (of which I was assured by a Person to whom three Copies of it were actually offer'd on Feb. 4. in the Afternoon, before I had sent, or indeed finished my first Letter to you, and which made me hasten the sending that Letter) does not look as if you desired private Information ; but as you had made your Challenge publick, so you expected a publick Dispute. That you should (after I had laid before you the Reasons and Testimonies of K. Charles's Innocence, contained in my Letter of Feb. 3. and represented the defectiveness of the Charge against him in point of Proof, and the necessity of its being proved before it could be needful to clear him) still persist in your Demand of having it more particularly disproved, send me yours of Feb. 4, and with a surprizing Modesty tell me, you think it a sufficient Reply to what I urged in mine for the King's Vindication, is, what will make me have a modest Opinion indeed of the Effect, which the Proofs that I have now brought of the King's Innocence may have on you towards your Conviction.

I have however answered your Challenge, and cleared the Business of the Marquess of *Antrim*, I have (what has been always been thought too unreasonable to be demanded) even proved a Negative, and shewn, that he was not concerned (as Mr. *Baxter* charges him) in the beginning of the Rebellion or Massacre,

factre, and that there is not the least Ground for the false and malicious Interpretation made of King *Charles* the II^d's sense in the Letter of *July* 10, 1663, I have therefore given you the Satisfaction you desired, and all the evidence that can be expected about a matter of Fact, and may therefore justly be allowed now to require you to make an Acknowledgment of the Royal Martyr's Innocence as Publick as your Charge against him was. This is the only Satisfaction that you can make for the Injury you have done his Memory, and Justice exacts it as far at your Hands, and if you decline doing it, it will give the World no advantageous Opinion, either of your Charity in advancing so abominable a Charge against King *Charles*, or of your Honesty not retracting it.

I shall take notice but of one thing more, and that is the Insults and Triumphs of many on the delay of this Answer. Well wishers to a good Cause, be it never so bad an one, can hardly conceal their Transports at every imaginary advantage that they gain; and what little Ground there was for their Triumphs and Confidences, you may by this time be sensible of, and it can hardly be needful for me to assure you that this delay was occasioned, not so much by the difficulty of clearing the point, which is the chief Subject of this, as by the vast hurry of the Business (of which they could not be Ignorant) incumbent on me in this place, which has been so great that from the Receipt of yours till the Date above, when I begun this Letter, I had not had one Hour any Day to my self, and which has caused me so many Avacations since, so that I have been obliged to defer sending to you till this Day, *February* 27.

I am,

S I R,

Your Humble Servant,

Thomas Carte.

MR. *Baxter* and Dr. *Calamy*, to support their Charge against King *Charles*, depend chiefly (as appears from their words quoted in this Letter) on two wretched Authorities indeed; The one is a Letter, said to be produced in the House of Commons in *England*, by the Marquess of *Antrim*; The other is the Pamphlet, called *Murder will out*; Concerning which, I am to observe that I have search'd for both, with all the diligence I could use, but without success; This is what I might well expect, with regard to the former, since Dr. *Calamy* expresses himself about it in such a manner, * that it looks as if he was Conscious that there was no such Letter in being.

And with regard to the Letter, I only get this Account, which is given by Mr. *Long*, in his Review of *Baxter's* Life, p. 207. That it is a scandalous Libel, written by one of the Regicides, and (as he thinks) by *Ludlow*, and published after the Revolution, when that infamous Wretch dared to return into *England*, in hopes of the protection of the Government, when in his, and other Pamphlets were published about the same time, all the Lies and Calumnies that had been ever raised of the Royal Family were reviv'd; and what regard such an Authority deserves, let any judge.

How far it is from deserving any in the present dispute, I have shewn already, in the Letter I sent to Mr. *Chandler* on February 27, from whom I have ever since waited for an Answer, but that perhaps is what I have no reason to expect. I might however at least hope for his thanks for giving him that proof of the King's Innocence which he had not seen, and called upon me to direct him to; This being what himself has offer'd, and bid me to expect. And whoever considers his seeming regard to the doing the Royal Martyr Justice, † his Protestation that he should be heartily glad to find the Calumny disproved, his giving me assurance that he would not dissemble any Satisfaction that is given him, his solemn Declaration in the presence of God, that he would heartily thank me for directing him to a Refutation of this Story, will think that these were encouragements enough to hope for thus much from him. For can it be imagined that such Protestations, such solemn appeals to God should mean nothing, and be attended with no effect? We know indeed what end they served, and what their meaning was in 1648: But sure those times are not returned, surely Men will not now dare to deal freely with God and his Providence, or make their appeals to him with that Hypocrisy which was practised then: One would in Charity hope that their assurances might be somewhat more to be depended on, and their declarations in the Presence of God, made with more sincerity of Heart. But at present in the Case before us, we can only hope this. Tis performance must give us assurance of it, and the longer

* Abridgement of *Baxter's* Life, p. 44. Edit. 1713. † See his 2 Letters.

longer that is delay'd, the weaker our hopes must be. For as Mr. *Chandler* cannot but know that Justice to the Martyr's Memory, (an obligation which with a needless care he has put me in mind of) requires him to publish his Satisfaction in the proofs of his Innocence that have been laid before him; so his desires likewise (if they are hearty, as he pretends they be) of seeing the Impious Calumny disproved, will not suffer him to delay this a Moment, will not let him dissemble his Satisfaction longer.

As for his promise of Thanks to my self, that, as far as is in my Power, I willingly release him, only desiring that Satisfaction may be made for the Injury done to King *Charles's* Memory, as the most pleasing return that can be made to me. His obligations to this, are too plain to be denied, and (may I hope! they) are too strong to be got for ever, and since I need not with Mr. *Chandler* more a knowledge than he has of his Duty, how to act in this Case, let me at least with him an Heart to perform it.

To provide however against a neglect, and to supply what has been hitherto wanting on his Part, I have taken this method to vindicate the King's Honour, and refute the charge against him; A method which seems the more necessary, because this story of the Marquess of *Antrim* is refer'd to as an established Truth, as an Authentick piece of History in p. 7 of a late Pamphlet, entitled *a Letter from a Gentleman at Dunkirk to a Nobleman in London*, who from what is said, p. 21 appears to be a Bishop.

I have but one thing more to add, which is, that I hope, if the Reader meets with any uncorrectness of expression in my 2 Letters, the haste and circumstances in which I wrote them, may be allowed as an excuse for it. But as for the main of the Argument, I desire no favour, for if I had not thought it clear, should not have troubled the World with it; And I cannot think this Nation yet so generally poisoned with ill principles, or to have so little sense of gratitude to King *Charles*, or regard for his Memory, as not to receive favourably a vindication of him, or to make it needful to use any other Apology for publishing it.

BATH, May 12. 1714.

Postscript.

SINCE it grates hard on human Nature, (such is the corruption of it.) to retract any error, and scarce any thing is a greater tryal of a Man's humility, and regard to Truth and Justice, to dispose Mr. Chandler the more readily to a publick vindication of King Charles from the charge against him, and to an ingenious Acknowledgment of his Error, and of the fallhood of his Prejudices in that point, let me recommend to him the Example of some of his own Brethren, not only that of Mr. Henderson, whose Recantation and Repentance are already Publick enough, and whose Memory is valued nothing more than for this part of his Conduct; but that likewise of Mr. Vines, a very celebrated Man among the Presbyterians in the Time of the Rebellion; of whose Sentiments of King Charles after the Treaty at Oxbridge, take this Account as it was given about the Year 1675 by Mr. Nathaniel Gilbert of Coventry, in an Information subscribed by his own hand; The original whereof is in the Custody of my Father now living in Leicester, and Minister of the Church of St. Martins there, to whose Grand mother the said Mr. Nathaniel Gilbert was half Brother there, and what I here publish, is taken from an attested Copy of it, now lying before me.

When Mr. Vines returned from the Treaty at Oxbridge, Mr. Walden being at London with Mr. Nathaniel Gilbert, News was brought to them, that Mr. Vines was returned, whereupon they both went to Mr. Vines, who, after usual Ceremonies between Friends, said with great affection, Brother Walden, How hath this Nation been soled? We have been told that our King was a Child and a Fool; But if I understand any thing by my converse with him, which I have had with great liberty, he is as much of a Christian Prince, as ever I read or heard of since our Saviour's time; He also said he is a very precious Prince, and is able of himself to argue with the ablest Divines we have.

Item That we gave such undeniable reasons for Episcopacy, &c. that the World could not answer them, that he had convinced him that it was agreeable to the Primitive Times.

As for his (meaning the King's) Clergy, there is no fence against their Flails, they are a great deal too hard for us.

That this, and much more to the same purpose was affirmed by Mr. Vines to Mr. Walden is attested by Nathaniel Gilbert.

Among the other things affirmed by Mr. Vines, my Father well remembers Mr. Gilbert told him this expression of his in relation to the King, viz. That among all the Kings of Israel and Judah, there was none like him.

F I N I S

Bishop

Archdean

Deacon

Chaplain

Steward

it.)
n's
the
a-
the
ex-
ofe
Me-
hat
s in
ter
ear
bed
ow
to
her
ow

den
em,
nes,
on,
that
my
much
me;
rgue

that
was

their

Mr.

ill re-
the
none

4
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100